

Commercial Union, Document No. 5.

PLAIN TALKS

—ON—

COMMERCIAL UNION

—BETWEEN—

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES,

—BY—

THOMAS SHAW,

Secretary of the Permanent Central Farmers' Institute,

HAMILTON, ONT.

He only is a truly loyal citizen who seeks the greatest good for the largest number of his own countrymen.

HAMILTON,

PRINTED BY GRIFFIN & KIDNER, KING WM. ST.
FOR THE AUTHOR

1907

PLAIN TALKS

—ON—

COMMERCIAL UNION

—BETWEEN—

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES,

—BY—

THOMAS SHAW,

Secretary of the Permanent Central Farmers' Institute,

HAMILTON, ONT.

He only is a truly loyal citizen who seeks the greatest good to the largest number of his own countrymen.

HAMILTON.

PRINTED BY GRIFFIN & KIDNER, KING WM. ST.
FOR THE AUTHOR.

1887

PLAIN TALKS
—ON—
COMMERCIAL UNION
—BETWEEN—
CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

THIS is without a doubt the most momentous question that agitates the public mind to-day in the Dominion of Canada. It relates to the welfare of no less than five millions of people on this side of the United States' northern boundary line, and of fifty-five millions on the other side of it. Its adoption or rejection will undoubtedly have an important bearing on the progress of every one of the individual Provinces that go to make up this great confederation, larger in extent than the entire domain of the United States. The question is so many-sided that it will affect all the leading industries of the country, agricultural or otherwise, in their entirety and in their sub-divisions, and also the material well-being of the humblest citizen engaged in the prosecution of these, so that no one who has the welfare of his country at heart can look upon the subject with cold indifference.

The rapidity with which this youngest and now incomparably the greatest of the public questions has gained a foothold in the land is very remarkable. The spontaneity, as it were, with which its first heraldings have been accepted, afford evidence that the germs of desire to obtain it already existed in the minds of a very large number, and that it wanted but the gentle showers of a mild agitation to rouse these into vigorous life. It is not the movement of the noisy politician, who tries to work upon the emotions of the masses. Its very calmness, and the reasonable nature of the measures adopted in its advocacy, are significant, bespeaking as they do at once the dignity of the movement and the consciousness on the part of its advocates that its advantages only require to be presented to reasonable men, when it is at once accepted by them. The leading newspapers in each of the Provinces have very largely espoused the cause, which is full of promise for its future, and which also very largely accounts

for the electric rapidity with which it has spread throughout all our borders from sea to sea.

The Origin of the Agitation.

The question was introduced into the 49th American Congress last winter, by the Hon. Benjamin Butterworth, who represents the city of Cincinnati in the United States Senate. It was purposely introduced toward the close of the session. He tells us himself, it was not his expectation that the proposed measure would even be discussed, much less adopted, by the United States Legislature before its next sitting. His object in introducing it at such a time was to fasten public attention upon it, which might lead to public discussion, and so pave the way for its adoption.

On February 23, Mr. E. Wiman, of New York—who, by the way, is a Canadian—delivered a most telling speech on the subject before the New York Board of Trade. Various other addresses were in the meantime delivered on the subject by Prof. Goldwin Smith, Toronto; the Hon. Mr. Butterworth, and others, before the Canadian Club in the afore-mentioned city; and the opinions of certain prominent public men from the United States and Canada had been expressed publicly by letter and otherwise, prominent amongst which we may mention those of the Hon. Robert R. Hitt, the United States Congress representative for Illinois, and of the Hon. J. W. Longley, Attorney-General of Nova Scotia.

Meanwhile, the farmers of Ontario, chiefly at the instigation of Mr. V. E. Fuller, the noted Jersey breeder, of Hamilton, Canada, had decided to move in the direction of representative Provincial organization, and had a meeting announced in the public press for the promotion of this object on the lines of the Farmers' Institutes, to be held in Toronto, on April 28. On seeing this, Mr. Wiman addressed an open letter, on the 26th of April, to Mr. Fuller, which was published in the Canadian press, setting forth the advantages of commercial union to the two countries. When the farmers met in convention, a Provincial Institute was formed for Ontario, at which the question of commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity as it was called, was discussed, and the following resolution anent the subject was carried by a very large majority:

"In the opinion of this Institute, a removal of all restrictions on trade between the Dominion of Canada and the United States is desirable, either by reciprocity or otherwise, as may be agreed upon by the respective countries, and the officers and executive committee of the Institute are hereby authorized to take such action in the premises as shall best promote the object of this resolution. In the event of fair reciprocity being unattainable, this Institute shall memorialize the Dominion Government to suggest to the Government of Great Britain the expediency of entering into a commercial union with her colonies in regard to food supplies and of imposing a protective tariff against all foreign countries."

The question was at once taken up by the subordinate Farmers' Institutes, and since that date it has been discussed in nearly all of these, while several

new Institutes have been called into existence on the very verge of harvest time, the busiest season of the year. Between the 28th day of April and the 4th day of August, resolutions had been carried in its favor in no less than *twenty-two* of the Institutes. Eleven of them had not taken a vote, although only waiting till the harvest should be housed for the further discussion of the question, five had not reported, and only one had carried a resolution in opposition, it is alleged in a packed meeting.

At the meeting of the executive of the Central Farmers' Institute, held in Toronto on the date already referred to, August 4, two of the officers of the Institute had the work delegated to them of organizing Institutes in electoral districts where they do not now exist, and through the medium of the Institutes it was decided to ascertain the minds of the farmers in the whole Province in regard to the question, by the formation of an organization for the purpose, in each electoral district or county in which the Farmers' Institutes had declared themselves favorable to commercial union.

Shortly after the formation of the Central Farmers' Institute of Ontario, a representative meeting of the manufacturers was hastily called in Toronto, which declared itself by resolution as being adverse to the movement; and on the 12th of May the matter was warmly discussed in the same city by the Board of Trade, and again on the 19th of the same, at an adjourned meeting, a resolution unfavorable to the measure was carried by a vote of sixty-three to forty—not a very signal victory in a city, the wholesale merchants of whom, more than those of any other city in Canada, fear the effects of competitive trade with New York.

Since that time it has been the momentous theme in all the secular newspapers of each of the Provinces, and it is surely an omen of brightest promise, that a majority of the most influential of these have declared themselves in favor of the measure, and are advocating it with exceptional earnestness in their foremost leaders every day. It is now the most fruitful theme of discussion in the home of the peasant and the legislator, in the railway carriage and the public house, so that long ago a fitting answer has been given to the scornful question more than once propounded, "Who is this Mr. Butterworth?" and the more sarcastic proposal even, made by a member of the Board of Trade, to "raise a subscription and send Mr. Wiman and his proposal back to New York." The name of this same Mr. Butterworth will soon be a household word in every hamlet of our northern Dominion homes, and the proposal of Mr. Wiman now bids fair to be sent back by our Government to Washington, rather than New York, for the ratification of the Government of the United States.

The measure is thus extending like the resistless advance of the tidal waves of the great deep. Notwithstanding the prompt measures taken to stay its progress, like the advance guard of a victorious army, it goes marching on. It is at least interesting to seek the reasons for this phenomenal advance. It is

not that capitalists have taken hold of it and through the potent influence of their thousands, have forced it upon the attention of the people through mercenary workers. It is not that some old veteran politician has come forward and assumed its leadership, for as yet the politicians have said nothing about it on the platform. Its advocates have been solely from the ranks of the people, men engaged in the ordinary pursuits of life. Nor is it that some noisy and talented demagogue has come upon the stage, and by the vehemence of his declamation has tried to make it for himself a stepping stone into power, for its advocacy has as yet been singularly calm and dignified. It occupies the somewhat unique position in this country of a movement of the people seeking the ratification of the Government, at least it is heading in this direction, rather than that of a movement of one or other of the government parties seeking the support of the people.

Whatever else about it is obscure, this is plain, that its announcement has found a wonderful response from the masses of this country, indicative of a preparedness of the soil for the reception of the seed, that has thus been sown broad-cast in a spring-time of unusual brevity. Usually the measures that revolutionize the settled order of things in realms composed of Provinces, having both a community and a diversity of interest, are the work of long years. The most potential forces in the realm have to be arrayed in their furtherance, before being received by a majority of the populace. But in reference to commercial union, the progress it has made is no less wonderful than the shortness of the time for this, and the shortness of the time even less astonishing than the means used in effecting such results.

There can be but one explanation given, and that is the *reasonableness* of the measure, commending itself to the good sense of the people. This, we believe, is a feature appertaining to it that has never yet been questioned by its bitterest opponent. Seed that is sown upon unploughed soil will not prove productive, hence the fact that the mention of the proposal for commercial union has already produced such promising results, makes it pretty clear that the minds of our Canadian farmers and those of various other classes have been ploughed pretty deeply of late years with the furrows of disappointment, and that the time has come for a change in our commercial relations. The unanimity of the testimony of our farmers in this respect has already administered fitting rebuke to the manufacturers, who at their meeting in Toronto patronizingly told the farmers that they were "doing well enough," as though they, the farmers, had been a race of imbeciles who were unconscious of their own condition.

The present is certainly very opportune for the discussion of this movement. No great political questions distract the public mind at the present time. The sky of our political horizon in this respect has never been more cloudless within the memory of the living. The rancor of political partizanship is dead or slumbering, and there are signs here and there cropping up of a disintegration of the old party lines, that may help to introduce a more rational era into the do-

main of Canadian politics than we have passed through during the last succession of decades. We are not on the eve of any exciting elections, so that no time more fitting could be found than the now present for the calm consideration of the subject by all classes of the community.

In the hope of throwing some additional light upon it, and thus making the study of it more effective, the preparation of this series of papers has been undertaken. The question, we have already said, is many-sided, so that in several of its aspects it is as yet imperfectly understood by those even who are satisfied that it points in the right direction. If we succeed in any degree in thus assisting our countrymen to secure a more enlightened fiscal policy we shall be more than repaid for the labor involved.

What is Implied in Commercial Union?

Commercial union between Canada and the United States implies a free interchange of all the products of both countries of whatsoever nature, whether of the waters, the soil, the sea and the mine. It would involve (1) an assimilation of tariff rates against all other countries; (2) of internal revenue taxes; and (3) very probably an arrangement for pooling receipts and customs, and distributing the same. It would be followed by the discontinuance of the services of a strong force of custom house officials on both sides of the boundary line of nearly 4,000 miles between the two countries, which is maintained at a cost to Canada of at least half a million of dollars annually.

The reasons assigned for its desirability in the preamble to the Bill introduced by Mr. Butterworth into Congress are, (1) To promote and encourage business and commercial intercourse between the people of both countries; (2) to enable the citizens of each to trade with the citizens of the other as fully and as freely as though there was no boundary line between the two countries; (3) to promote harmony between the two Governments which shall be so complete and effective that all existing controversies and all causes of controversy in matters relating to trade may be removed. And the great reasons assigned as to why all this is desirable are the *contiguity* of the two countries, and the *similarity* of the interests and occupations of the people thereof. By the adoption of this treaty it is expected that it would afford a solution of the fishery question, which, during almost the entire period of the past century, has given rise to the most serious complications.

That such results would follow is exceedingly probable. Trade between two countries always involves the idea of mutual advantage. Where such is not the result, trade must cease. Where the conditions on which trade is based are similar or nearly so, the advantages cannot but be mutual, and in the event of commercial union in the line of the basis indicated, the conditions would be very similar. Both countries have products that the other wants, and these are produced under conditions very similar as regards the price of labor. If

under tariff disabilities the volume of trade between the two countries is considerable, how much more would it not be with these disabilities removed, and if the very idea of trade involves that of material advantage, how very largely would this material advantage increase with the increase of trade?

To leave the boundary line for purposes of trade as nature made it would be pleasant indeed, and mutually advantageous. To erect a commercial barrier between British Columbia and the rest of the Dominion would be much more rational than to establish one between Manitoba and Minnesota. There might be good reasons for establishing this barrier when bordering nations and States differ in their aims, degree of civilization, and language; but when there is no danger of contamination in the evil sense in any form, it does seem a high-handed step to take, when people are prevented from trading freely with their neighbors and are in a manner compelled to deal in the same commodities with those living remote from them.

That the harmony of the two governments would be promoted by this union should not be questioned, for the most direct way of insuring the greater harmony of communities, as all past experience has taught us, is to promote intercourse. It is when they have no dealings with one another that their suspicions arise and linger, and that they assume the attitude of the Jews and the Samaritans. When two individuals disagree and neither one has anything at stake, they are but little disposed to compromise, but where there is much at stake they are more readily disposed to come to terms, and the degree of their willingness is usually in proportion to the extent of the risks they hazard. In this way we can easily conceive the commercial interests of the two countries so increased and so inter-dependent, that there could be little or no fear of a war arising between them.

Again, if the adoption of this measure would secure an amicable settlement of the fishery disputes—and we see no good reason why it should not—it would accomplish in this one line more than all the costly legislation of the past one hundred years on the subject.

There are some in our midst who favor what they term “unrestricted reciprocity” between the United States and Canada, harboring a groundless fear that political union will eventually follow in the wake of commercial union. We will speak of that further on, but may here say that this is purely a question of *economics*, not one of *politics*. If a full measure of free trade is sure to be followed by political union, then it follows by logical sequence, that the chances of political union between bordering nations retaining their individuality will be in proportion to the degree of their isolation or contiguity as regards trade, and their only absolute safety will consist in complete isolation in matters of trade.

The arguments furnished by the churches also points in the opposite direction. These are organizations within the State. Now it has been found that by coming into more fraternal relations their harmony is promoted, even to the

extent of agreement on some of the lines by which they seek to further interests common to each ; but this has not been done in a single instance at the sacrifice of *organic* identity. Now, if an organization within the State preserves its organic identity unimpaired while its fraternal relations are always growing, the fear, then, is groundless that one State will endanger or lose its political identity, because it enters into closer trade relations with another.

There is really no difference between what is implied by the use of the terms commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity in this case, for the latter involves an assimilation of tariffs and internal revenue, as well as the former. The terms are synonymous and interchangeable. We need not expect to get unrestricted trade with the United States and deal with outside countries as we please ; nor would we be willing that the United States should enjoy this privilege from us, and deal with other countries as she pleased.

It is Not a Political Question.

We have already stated that this is not a political question, but one of *economics*. It does not in any way interfere with the principles of government as such, but confines itself solely to the aspect of the advancement of the material condition of the people. It is true that efforts have been made, and very likely will be made in future, to give it a political aspect, but we most earnestly ask our countrymen not to allow themselves to be led away from the proper consideration of the subject by any party cry, but to look at it mainly in the light of *material advantage*. The vital matter is not whether its adoption or rejection will put one party into power and keep the other out, but will it be on the whole a material gain to a large majority of the people of this country.

Observe, it does not involve any sacrifice of the foundation principles of free trade or of protection, while at the same time it forms a common meeting ground where the most pronounced advocates of both systems may shake hands fraternally and exchange sincerest greetings. It recognizes the two fundamental principles that should govern all trade, of which the first reads thus—where the conditions are equal, or nearly so, all trade should be free ; and the second thus—where the conditions are not equal, or nearly so, industries, more particularly infant industries, should be protected. Where the conditions are equal and protection still reaches out her covering wings, the result is *monopoly*, and monopoly of the worst kind, for it is monopoly for one class of citizens fed from the pockets of another class of them. To say that the citizens of the United States want protection from the competition of the people of Canada is absurd, and for any Canadian to affirm that her citizens want protection from the competition of the United States, where the conditions are so nearly equal, is at least a humiliating confession. While the disciples of each of the two systems have been pitching at each other's throats, nations have been growing great under both, which surely ought to be conclusive that the measure of each

to be adopted should have a reference to *conditions*. Britain has been growing magnificently great under a free trade régime, and the United States has made the most gigantic strides under a protective one. Mr. Butterworth, so largely responsible for the present agitation, is a life-long protectionist, as are some of the most ardent of its advocates in Canada. We trust, then, that party politics will not be allowed to make the question of commercial union the pedestal on which it will plant the pillar of its hopes, or the grave within which either of the parties may find sepulture. Party politics has its proper ends to serve, and grand ones they are, when it fulfills its mission, but it is no part of the latter to fatten or famish in consequence of the success or non-success of an economic question. We trust rather to find the two parties shaking hands over the advocacy and ratification of this question, and presenting the sublime spectacle to the world that for once in its history two political parties are agreed upon the fact that their common country has interests which it is the duty of both at the same time to further.

From 1854 to 1866 Canada and the United States had free trade in certain products, particularly those relating to agriculture, and so advantageous did the latter prove to Canada that she has ever since evinced a desire to have free trade relations renewed, and that desire has been evidenced by the efforts put forth by politicians, on both sides of politics, to bring about reciprocal trade in greater or less degree. The benefits of freedom of trade between the two countries are shown by the great increase in the volume of trade during the reciprocity term. In 1853 the volume of trade was, in round numbers, but \$20,000,000. In 1854, the first year of reciprocity, \$33,000,000, and in 1866 it had more than quadrupled, being no less than \$84,000,000, although the population of Canada at that time was only in the neighborhood of 3,000,000. Mr. Turcotte, in his "*Le Canada L'Union*," a history of the two provinces from 1841 to 1887, states in regard to this treaty, "that it was highly advantageous to the whole country." The farmers of the Eastern Townships at the same time freely acknowledge that while then they lifted mortgages, now they are going back. The treaty was not renewed because it was found that under its provisions Canada had had the advantage, although efforts were made to have it renewed. In reference to these Mr. John Bright wrote to Mr. Aspinwall, of Detroit, in 1865, in response to an invitation to attend the Reciprocity Convention: "It will be a miserable thing if, because they (the British North American Provinces) are in connexion with the British crown, and you acknowledge the President as your chief magistrate at Washington, there should not be a commercial intercourse between them and you as free as if you were one people living under one government." This statement is in keeping with the recent public utterance of that great English statesman addressed by him to Canadians, wherein he says: "If you mean by commercial union, that no tariff should exist between the two countries, such a condition would be greatly to their mutual advantage."

In the negotiations carried on by the Macdonald-Cartier Government, from July, 1869, to March, 1870, with that of the United States, the measure of reciprocity offered by the former included the assimilation of our customs and excise duties, and the concession of an import duty equal to the internal revenue taxes of the United States, the free interchange of natural products and certain manufactures, the cession of the use of our fisheries for a term of years to the Americans, the enlargement of our canals, and the free use of these and of the navigation of the St. Lawrence by the Americans.

In 1871, the British representatives stated they considered that the reciprocity treaty of the 5th June, 1854, should be restored in principle.

In 1874 the MacKenzie Government employed Sir Edward Thornton and the Hon. George Brown to negotiate a commercial treaty with the United States. The draft treaty embraced ten propositions. We shall not stay to enumerate these, but may mention they included the enlargement of the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, the construction of the Caughnawaga and Whitehall canals, the mutual enjoyment of the coasting trade of the great lakes and the St. Lawrence, the mutual use of the Canadian, New York and Michigan canals, the reciprocal admission of vessels to registry, a joint commission to protect and propagate fish in the inland waters common to both countries, the concession to the United States of our fisheries for twenty-one years, and the admission duty free into both countries of a long list of natural products and of manufactured goods, such as agricultural implements, cotton goods, furniture, carriages and sleighs, iron of all kinds, leather and harness, and manufactures of wood. Each of these proposals came to naught, because the United States did not accept them.

It is hence apparent that Canada has never ceased to look and hope for better facilities for trading with the people of the United States, since the expiration of the old reciprocity treaty in 1866. And in her efforts to secure this, two things are very worthy of note: First, the basis of negotiations as to articles of free barter has continually *enlarged*, culminating as it has in the proposed bill of Mr. Butterworth to sweep away the last remnant of restriction in the trade of the two countries; and second, these propositions have emanated from *both* sides of politics, first one and then the other.

Sir John Macdonald, the veteran leader of the Conservative party, has left no doubt as to his views of the advantages of reciprocal trade with the United States. He is reported, by the then chief Conservative organ, as having said in a speech at Napanee, on Sept. 11th, 1877, that he was a Free Trader if he could get free trade, but it was not his intention to have a jug-handled policy. If they could not have reciprocity of trade, they should have reciprocity of tariffs. Such was his policy, and he asked if they would sustain it.

At Cobourg, August 29th, 1877, Sir John Macdonald proved to his own satisfaction that it was the Canadian farmer, and not the United States brewer,

who pays the duty of fifteen cents per bushel on the grain that is sent to the United States. The Canadian farmer would raise his barley for say \$1.00 a bushel, but it would not be the brewer who would pay the 15c. He paid \$1.00 for his barley, no matter where it was grown, but the duty came out of the pocket of the Canadian farmer; this state of affairs was not right, and he appealed to the farmer to support those who pledged themselves to defend their interests. The mottoes at Cobourg were, "No compromise," "Reciprocity or "Protection."

At Newmarket, September 14th, he said, "If we cannot get reciprocity of trade, we must get reciprocity of tariff."

At Owen Sound, October 5th, he said the Conservative maxim is, "If we cannot get reciprocity of trade we must have reciprocity of tariffs;" and at Hamilton, September 17th, "I want the Canadians to say to the Americans, 'we will have free trade, fair trade or reciprocal trade if you like, but if you will not have any of these, we will have a reciprocity of tariff. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.'"

It is thus apparent that Sir John Macdonald was at that time in favor of free trade with the United States, and that a protective tariff was adopted because the first was unattainable. What the great leader of a party favors should not be so very distasteful to his followers, as to cause them to array themselves in the attitude of uncompromising opposition.

Physical Conditions Call for It.

Take a map of the North American continent, examine it carefully, note well the physical conditions of the two countries, and you cannot but be convinced of the short-sightedness of the men who are trying to keep Canada and the United States apart for purposes of trade. The dividing line is not formed by impassable mountain barriers, and during the entire land line of nearly three thousand miles, it could not be known but for the iron pillars which mark its course. Even the system of lakes which separate certain provinces bring them into closer proximity by the facilities which they afford for transit. Certain large and populous States are located to the westward of this chain of water communication, which would afford to them a natural outlet to the sea. On the west, British Columbia has ready means of water communication with all the great American cities on the Pacific seaboard, but is separated by lofty mountain ranges from the Northwest territories and by thousands of miles of land transit from the great commercial centres of the provinces of the confederation. The immense plains of the Northwest that are being opened up for settlement are within a short run by rail of the great cities of the Northwestern States, as St. Paul and Minneapolis, while the most easterly city of Manitoba, Winnipeg, is 1,423 miles from Montreal; Calgary, at the base of the Rocky Mountains, 2,262 miles, and Victoria, in British Columbia, 2,990 miles. Ontario is sur-

rounded by flourishing cities on her very borders, as Buffalo and Detroit, and the great manufacturing centres of New England are not nearly so far distant from either Ontario or the Maritime Provinces as these are from each other. The Maritime Provinces are separated from Montreal by more than a thousand miles of rugged territory, where the railway communication is limited in winter by blockade after blockade of snow, but are at the same time within easy and cheap communication of the American seaboard. It is plain, therefore, that nature intended that the British Columbians should trade with Californians and the people of Oregon, that those of Manitoba should have access to the markets of the flourishing cities of Minnesota, yet destined to become superlatively great; that the people of Ontario should have access to all the markets along her border, that she should have trade communication with New York rather than with Quebec, and that the people of the Maritime Provinces should trade to their heart's content with the people of New England. And so in every instance named, the trade should be reciprocal. The British Columbian with his coal and fish would get manufactured goods and provisions from a warmer clime; the Manitobans, in exchange for the products of the soil, could get goods and manufactured articles; the people of Ontario would send their live-stock and the products thereof to the markets across the border, and in return get such manufactures and productions as her climate does not yield, and also the coal of Pennsylvania; and those of the Maritime Provinces would send their fish, their potatoes, their live-stock and their coal and iron to the New England States, in return for everything they might want. Any arrangement other than this is nothing short of a crime against nature and against man, and yet it is a crime that has been perpetrated. British Columbia paid on June 30th, \$2.60 per cwt. for the transit of sugar from Montreal, and \$3 per cwt. for nails, a price in excess of the first cost of the nails at Montreal; and at the same date the quotation for the carriage of wool was \$4.80 per cwt. loose, and \$2.50 in car lots compressed, from the Pacific to Montreal via the C. P. R. Freight on flour from Chatham, Ont., to Halifax on the first of July was 65 cents per barrel, with a rebate of 16 cents for large lots, while transit was so low from Boston to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick that it was being shipped there in the face of a duty of 50 cents per barrel.

The physical argument, then, is unanswerably in favor of commercial union with the United States. It not only affords the nearest market, which in the end must be the cheapest, but it gives us access to a country which could supply us with nearly everything we want.

Before the confederation the Hon. Geo. Brown claimed that New England furnished Nova Scotia with breadstuffs to the amount of \$4,400,000 annually. He thought that by the construction of the Intercolonial railway this trade would fall to Ontario and Quebec. Well, it is a costly way of securing it by paying half a million annually by way of subsidy. Nor have the people down by the sea ever taken kindly to the scheme, and who should blame them,

since a long line of railway through a desolate country can never compete with a short water route over an open sea. The Hon. J. W. Longley, the Attorney-General of Nova Scotia, reminds us that the difference in passenger fare from Montreal or Boston was as 1 to 3 in favor of the latter. And so of traffic, that it is as much to the advantage of the Maritime Provinces to buy flour from the United States, as for Ontario to get its coal from Pennsylvania. They are now in a manner forced to buy flour from Ontario and to pay cash for it, whereas if it were possible to buy in eastern markets, the buyer would become a seller. If duty was off coal, the Nova Scotian miner would sell ten tons of coal in New England where he now sells one in Quebec. It must be patent to any one who has given the subject study, that there can be but little natural trade between the Maritime Provinces and Ontario and Quebec, between the latter and Manitoba and the N. W., and between these and British Columbia.

As to Quebec Province, it does not matter very much what the physical conditions of trade are to her. So long as she retains her present attitude of isolation, the greater the barriers to trade, physical and otherwise, the better will she be pleased. If isolation in commerce will make a people great, then the destiny of Quebec in her present frame of mind is one of superlative greatness.

This argument from geographical contiguity is severe on the advocates of an Imperial Zollverein between Britain and her colonies. Separation makes this impracticable. With commercial union between Canada and the United States, anything that the latter could furnish would be more cheaply done by the United States than by countries far away, unless what might be in the line of British manufactures, to which free access would be worse for our industries by far than to go into commercial union with the United States. We are separated from Britain by 3,000 miles of sea, from New Zealand by many thousands more, and as many thousands intervene before we reach Australia and India.

It Will Not Discriminate Unfairly Against Great Britain.

It is argued that commercial union between Canada and the United States, with a common protective tariff against all outside countries, will be an instance of unfair discrimination against England.

We answer that if Britain has a claim on us for preferential discrimination in the arrangement of our tariffs, she has not got it under our present tariff arrangements, and for this the commercial union agitation is not responsible. If it is the right thing to extend to Britain, then our legislators have not done that right thing. If the relations of Great Britain to Canada give her no claim for preferential discrimination in her favor over other countries, then it follows that even though she were discriminated against in common with other countries, she would have no just ground of complaint. The point here is certainly

clear: if Great Britain has special claims upon us in this matter, then those special claims have not been recognized, and no one in Canada has shouted disloyalty notwithstanding. Now, if it be the right thing to discriminate against Great Britain, in one degree in matters of trade, it cannot be wrong to discriminate against her in another degree.

But let us look into the matter. How far has Britain claims upon us in this line. She cannot hold a closer relationship to us than that of parent to child. As a parent, what has she done for us in matters of trade? Why, just what she has done for all the world. The villainous Mahdi, the murderer of Britain's hero, Gordon, is just as free to trade with England as any citizen of Canada. But it is objected, she has not discriminated against us. Very true, but if the relationship should bind us to discriminate in her favor, it should bind her to do the same. She has it in her power to discriminate in our favor, but she will not, because it would not be to her interest. On the same principle, then, our interest should govern us in arranging our fiscal relations, and this is just the line of argument used by Sir John Macdonald, when he said that, "as a self-governing people, we have a right to consult our own interest first."

We may imagine the case of a parent, whose son has gone to a far away clime, to do business on his own account. That parent represents England; that son, Canada. The boy sets out with nothing in his hand; there he has to fight his way, and ultimately he becomes fairly prosperous. Intercourse between the son and the parent continues, and it is found mutually advantageous. But there comes a time when the son sees his opportunity of making a splendid bargain, but its acceptance would interfere somewhat with the rich old man's future gains, till he had time to readjust his plans. Would it not be cruel on the part of the old man to say to the son that he must forego the advantage for his (the father's) sake; or in other words, that the son must sacrifice the most splendid prospects of material gain, that the old man might secure a little more gain? The relationship between parent and child is very sacred, and we are reminded that we should honor gray hairs, but this even has its limits. The duty of the child to the parent till he has attained his majority, is that of unquestioned obedience, unless in things commanded that might be contrary to the law of heaven. After that period the son is at liberty to direct his own affairs. Now, it would be very pleasant if the counsels of the father should be continued in such a way that the son might profit by them, but if the old man gave counsel that was clearly wrong or even impolitic, the son would be in the line of duty not to accept, and if the old man persisted in thrusting it upon him, the son would be justified in resisting it. If opportunity arose, whereby the son could greatly better his condition, and the old man opposed on the grounds of some slight injury that would result to his business, would not the son be justified in pointing to his own children, and saying, father *I will do this*, for it is my first duty to provide for those that shall live after me, as it was yours in

days gone by? Who will say, who will dare to say, that that son would not be doing the proper thing? and if the advantage that was to accrue came from dealing with an older brother, as is the case with Canada, the opposition of the old man would be utterly inexcusable. Now the relationship of kingdom and colony cannot be closer than that of father and son, hence in the analagous parallel Canada should not be faulted for seeking commercial union with the United States, even though it should discriminate against England.

But has Britain the right to interfere, or having that right, would it be politic for her to use it? Clearly not, is our answer to the second question, whatever answer may be given to the first. Britain, like an impolitic old man, interfered with matters of trade when his first-born had set up for himself, and it cost the former a colony, and though interference at the present time might be more excusable, it would be clearly impolitic, for as has been pointed out elsewhere, "the destiny of Canada is now practically confided to Canadians. Her future is her own, and surely she is in the best position to know "what will be best for herself." The loyalty of the people of Canada to-day is quite as strong as it was prior to the troublous times of 1837, when she enjoyed much less of liberty and privileges than she does at present, and we feel assured that Britain under the influence of a more matured statesmanship and with the advantages of the experience of the past, would not interfere with any of her colonies in such a way that the relations between them would be abraded.

It is only natural that those engaged in the industries in Britain should feel somewhat sore. The National Policy was adopted in the face of a violent protest from the manufacturer and artizan in England, and witness now the storm raised in reference to the iron interest; yet in no instance has the Government of Britain interfered. Why should it interfere? It has never yet been shown that it is the duty of Canadians to seek the welfare of the English manufacturer and artizan first, rather than to attend to the wants of their own households. The people of Canada are surely in a better position to judge as to their wants than the people of England.

But it is premature to assert that there would be any discrimination against England, more injurious than there is now, or that would be more hostile than present arrangements. The average difference between the United States tariff and that of Canada is about 10 per cent., and it is exceedingly probable that the United States will lower her tariff somewhat, as her sources of revenue are too great, an affliction not very prevalent amongst the nations of the earth. If her protective tariffs were reduced but 5 per cent., and those of Canada increased the same, the situation for England would be more favorable all round, for the volume of her trade with the United States is greater than with Canada, so that it is not improbable that the arrangement, so far as England is concerned, would be to her advantage.

When Mr. John Bright reminds us that "if the present Canadian tariff "were maintained for imports other than from the States, England would be

"at a great disadvantage in her trade with Canada," he does not make allowance for the possibility, nay, even the probability, of the other arrangement. And although we feel like standing uncovered in the old man's presence, we cannot refrain from giving utterance to the rejoinder, that if the present Canadian tariff, or something very like it, is *not* maintained for imports other than from the States, Canada will be at a great disadvantage in her trade with the United States, her nearest neighbor.

It is apparent, therefore, that the strongest argument expressed in favor of the advantages of union in trade with Great Britain consists of *sentiment*. Now sentiment is mere thought flowing from feeling. It has its place in the building up of individual and national character, but should never be allowed to overmaster reason, in which case it always leads to disaster. If sentiment has a legitimate field anywhere, it is in the arrangement of those delicate relations that end in matrimony; but even here, if allowed to run counter, either to the inexorable logic of facts, or to the faithful teachings of reason, the result is that too late the interested parties

"Awaken from their dream of joy,
To lead a life of cold alloy."

If it is a dangerous thing, then, to give full rein to sentiment in the formation of a union that interests but *two* persons, how much more is it dangerous in the formation of a union that interests 60,000,000 of people!

It would be a sad mistake, if for the sake of the doubtful advantages of a market beyond 3,000 miles of sea, with something over 30,000,000 of people, sentiment alone led us to forego the advantages of trade with 55,000,000 of people just at hand. It is surely a miserable form of sentiment that would, unmoved, behold the stagnation of the business of one's entire country, the best of her sons undergoing self-expatriation, and the most magnificent resources remaining undeveloped, and all because of a feeling that it might *seem* like giving a preference to the United States by seeking a market freedom with her. The real preference that we are seeking is material advantage, and sentiment is surely not fulfilling its mission when it runs counter either to material comfort or material advantage. If union in trade between Britain and her colonies would greatly benefit Britain there might be some reason in this argument, but this has not been shown, and until it is shown, it is unpatriotic and un-Canadian to ask Canada to make a sacrifice so great, for no other reason than that of national sentiment.

Where there has been occasion for Canada to sacrifice for Britain's sake, she has not been slow in furnishing evidence of her willingness to do so. The country which evinced her readiness to send her sons as soldiers to the Crimea and as oarsmen to the Nile, will not be slow to manifest her loyalty to the grand old Monarchy whenever occasion offers. But that is quite different from asking Canada to be content with leanness in many of the thousands of her agricultural homes for the sake of sentiment. Sentiment is all very well in its

place, but it should not be allowed to tie the progress of a country to a farmer's cart, when it might as well go forward at the speed of a chariot.

A Zollverein Between Great Britain and Her Colonies Not Practicable.

This, as we have said before, is a dream of Imperial Federationists never to be realized. When the subject was brought up at the time of the organization of the Central Farmers' Institute of Ontario, along with a good many others there, we rather liked the idea. There is a sacredness of association lingering around the old Empire that is very dear to her colonial-children, and makes them anxious to do her reverence whenever opportunity offers. The old flag that has defended them in the hour of their extremity is to them the emblem of all that is great and noble, and as dutiful children, they are always ready to fall in with the reasonable wishes of their parent beyond the seas ; but we have already shown that there are limits to filial duty. A parent may even go the length of exacting too much of the child, and brethren may expect too much of one of their number. So would it be if Britain and the other colonies were to go into commercial Federation and ask of Canada to take a share in the arrangement, for not one of these colonies is situated regarding neighbors as Canada is. India is separated from alien races of a different language and religion by lofty mountains. Australia and New Zealand are without near neighbors in a sense, and the colonies of Africa are in contiguity with heathen tribes. It is no great sacrifice to them not to trade much with their neighbors ; but not so with Canada, bordering on a country that can supply them with a great portion of all they want, a country that, like they are, was once a colony, even now only an older brother that had an unfortunate altercation with those at the old home, the same in language, interests, religion and aims, and so situated that the solid land mark between them is more than 2,500 miles long. If coming into the proposed compact would shut Canada out from this country commercially, should the parent or the other members of the compact complain though Canada should remain outside ? We answer, No.

Since looking into the matter more carefully, we have concluded that the proposed Zollverein is impracticable, and have, therefore, though reluctantly, abandoned the idea altogether.

We look upon it as impracticable :

- (1) Because the compact would cost *Britain* too much.
- (2) Because it would cost *Canada* too much.
- (3) Because it would cost the *other colonies* too much.

It would cost Britain too much. If there is an arrangement entered into between Britain and her colonies to trade with each other, and at the same time to erect tariffs that would measurably fence out all the world besides, the world by way of just retaliation would measurably fence out them. Now the

question arises whether the other portion of the world would get along better without trade with them, or they without the other nations thereof, which form three-fourths and more of the world's population. The United States far outnumber Britain now in her population, and also in her natural resources. The former country, proverbial for her sagacity in bargain making, would not be slow to take advantage of this state of affairs, and could readily make such arrangements as would dislodge Britain in part or altogether from her hold in many lines of her manufacture in the outside world. This would mean disaster to the trade of Great Britain, for, owing to the excellence and cheapness of her articles, she forces them into all countries barbarous and civilized, even in the face of high tariffs, and of these her colonies all told only take a fragmentary portion. For instance, out of a total export in 1885 of \$1,357,018,470, Canada only took \$40,601,199, or about the one-thirty-ninth part of the whole. Of goods of her own manufacture in that year, amounting to \$1,065,222,500, Canada took of dutiable goods but \$30,385,797. Her customers now number 14,000,000,000, while her colonies all told—that is, the English speaking portion of them—do not at the present time number more than twelve or thirteen millions; hence, we may judge of the fragmentary nature of that portion of her exports consumed by her colonies. It is clear that, for long decades, her colonies would not suffice to consume her goods, providing they made no further progress in manufactures themselves, which stationary condition would prove fatal to their prosperity. Again, England cannot afford to become a protective country, for the moment she does, she shuts out the breadstuffs of the world and makes dear the food that feeds her industrial classes, which in turn enhances the cost of production in a marked degree. While this might help the agricultural portion of her population, it would harm the industrial classes, which stand to the former about as twenty is to one. England, therefore, cannot afford to do it.

It would cost Canada too much. In one sense it would be a good thing for the farmers of Canada, but in another sense it might not. It would be good for them in so far as they would get more for their beef and wheat, at the expense, remember, of the British artisan; but they would be certain to lose the American market, which in 1886 amounted in agricultural products to the sum of \$15,495,783, while the trade with Britain in the same year was but \$22,543,936. Now if commercial union with the United States was going to cause Britain to put a tariff on the products she gets from us, we might hesitate to sacrifice the present market of \$41,542,629 with Great Britain for the \$36,578,769 with the United States. But if Britain take this step, by so doing she would vex a very large proportion of her people who work in products of the mine and the forest, and are dependent on us for supplies of agricultural products and those of the sea. But while it might be a doubtful gain to the farmer, it would be disastrous to the manufacturer. Our manufacturers could never stand before hers. The country that can scale the high tariff walls of the

United States with her manufactured goods, would inundate us with these if wholly unprotected; and if partially protected they could not have that vigorous life that would follow opening up to Canada all the United States market. British manufacturers have vastly the advantage over ours. (1) In the cheap labor employed. (2) The amount of capital employed. (3) The rate of interest on capital. (4) The advantage accruing from priority of establishment. (5) The benefits that flow from ability to concentrate on the production (a) of a single line of goods, and (b) of some branch of that line; and (6) The extent of the market.

As regards labor it is stated by Professor Leoni Levi in a work on England's supremacy, a careful statistician, who has given much thought to the subject, that the average rate of wages paid by manufacturers in the United States is 56 per cent. higher than in Britain, and we will show further on that the price of labor is much the same in the States and Canada. Now, other things being equal, a very small variation in the price of labor gives the country the advantage where the labor is cheaper. Canada, then, could never stand before Britain in her manufactures with such a disparity in the price of labor.

As regards the rate of interest, we have already shown that while in Canada the rate is or has been from 6 to 7 per cent., in England it is from 3 to 3½, which in itself would constitute a good profit.

As regards the amount of capital employed, Britain has overwhelmingly the advantage. Her wealth in this respect is simply proverbial, and enables her to take advantage (a) of the benefits of production on an enormous scale, and (b) of all the skill, mechanical improvements and trade facilities that money can command. This the weaker capitalist cannot do.

As regards priority of establishment, the advantages are that better facilities for obtaining supplies have been arranged for, and a market has been established with all the advantages that accrue from longer business experience. It may be argued that newer works have the advantage over old ones, in that they have all the latest improvements at the outset, but this is not sufficient, as we deem it, to overcome the advantages of priority of establishment.

As regards concentrating on one line of production, when the market has been sufficiently established, it gives the manufacturer a prodigious advantage, and if concentration can be fastened on one branch of a line, this still enhances the advantage. Thus it is that some cities in Britain are wholly devoted to the manufacture of one line of goods, as Leeds and Sheffield. In this we behold concentration of skill in its utmost excellence, and its transmission from generation to generation, with all the additions that inventive genius can give to it.

In regard to the market, England practically has the world, while Canada has herself. She has walled herself in so completely that the exports of her manufactures, all told, from the whole Dominion, only amount to \$2,824,137, although she has far greater natural resources within herself than Britain,

though these may be more widely scattered. Britain's market gives her a tremendous advantage, so that the manufactures of Canada cannot hope to stand unprotected before her. Canada, therefore, cannot afford it.

It would cost the colonies too much. This is not so easily shown with the data we have at hand, but the same line of arguing will measurably apply to the colonies, especially in regard to their manufactures; therefore, the colonies cannot afford to go into such a union.

The Adoption of Commercial Union will Save the Confederation.

This implies that the Confederation of the Provinces is in danger of falling asunder, a fact that no one at all skilled in reading the signs of the times will deny. On the first day of July, 1867, the Provinces of British North America went into confederation, except the Island of Newfoundland, the scheme ultimately embracing all the country north of the United States boundary line, except the Island of Newfoundland, Greenland and Alaska, thus embracing a territory larger than that of the United States. Hitherto the colonies had been bound together politically, unless in the case of Upper and Lower Canada, by no other tie than that of their being colonies of Great Britain. The idea of welding them together into a strong confederation was one that pretty generally commended itself to the favorable consideration of the people, inasmuch that it was adopted, and for a time all went fairly well; but of late years things have got sadly out of joint.

That facilities for trade might be increased, and in the hope of assisting its outflow from the individual Provinces and turning it into inter-Provincial channels, public works have been undertaken at great expense, which has plunged the confederation very deeply in debt, and this debt is still increasing at the average rate of \$10,000,000 a year since the year 1876, the whole of the Federal debt on the 30th June summing up \$225,026,762, or, not allowing for worthless assets, it would foot up \$300,000,000. This latter sum would hold every individual in the Dominion on an average responsible for the payment of the sum of \$60. Serious as this phase of the situation may appear, it is not exactly the cause of the discontent that we speak of. Many of these works were necessary, and in time we will largely reap the benefits that they are intended to confer. Give our people a chance and they will grapple with this indebtedness, and in the spirit of emulation not to be outdone by our southern neighbors will, like them, hope to look the whole world in the face, owing not any man.

The cause of the discontent has arisen from the fiscal policy adopted by our country, necessary perhaps for a time, but unwise in its prolongation. By virtually shutting the doors of ingress and egress for the natural channels of trade, the attempt was made to force them east and west rather than north and

south. On the one side was a country of vast extent, with an average width of 1,300 miles, in a manner self-contained in both developed and undeveloped resources, and on the other a strip of inhabited country on an average 100 miles in width and more than 3,000 miles in length, far from self-contained in either developed or undeveloped resources, shut out from the privilege of trading with her southern neighbor unless by climbing over a high tariff wall, and forced to trade within herself, throughout the discouraging length of her entire territory.

Why should not the inhabitants in such a position become discontented? Uncomplaining submission in such a case would have been a libel on the spirit and the independence of the Anglo-Saxon race. The people of the Provinces were compelled to pay heavy charges for the transit of goods over railways which they were taxed to build, and in many instances to the producers of these goods for bringing them into existence, and the markets of each of them so narrowed that a depression more deep and prolonged has settled down upon the country than was ever known in its history. Nor were they allowed to construct channels of trade for themselves. The Red River Valley railroad, seeking an outlet, has been disallowed, and other railways intended to develop the internal trade of the Northwest has been disallowed. The very questionable policy has been adopted of allaying the discontent in the different Provinces by subsidies in one form or another, which can only encourage discontent to make fresh demands.

It reminds one of the plan of the Athenian citizens after the sun of the glory of this learned republic had begun to set, who voted to themselves large sums of money for attending on the great councils of the nation, without first considering where the large sums should come from, or of the barbarians bordering on Rome after the days of the zenith of her power. The large sums paid to them to keep them at bay for the time, only served to encourage them to make fresh incursions.

This feeling of discontent is fast reaching a culminating point, and unless prompt measures are taken, the confederation wheel may be broken beyond the possibility of restoration. The disallowed railway is being built, the tax on tobacco which the *habitant* was to pay he refuses to pay, and the people of Nova Scotia said at the last election that they were anxious to get out of confederation. Why, then, have they not gone out of it? Because it takes two parties to dissolve an agreement as well as to make one. It is always easier to get into a pit than to get out of it again, to tie a knot than to untie it.

That such is the feeling in the Maritime Provinces we have but to quote the opinions of Nova Scotians themselves, publicly expressed. Mr. W. F. MacCoy, the member for Shelburne, stated in the House of Assembly last winter that they now must buy their supplies in Boston and pay 50 cents per barrel on flour and 22 per cent. on other articles, or return with the money and buy dear Upper Province foods on reaching home. "I ask every fair-

"minded man in the house," said Mr. MacCoy, "to answer truly as to our present position. Is not our trade being ruined, and is not our real estate 50 per cent. less than it was ten years ago?"

Be it remembered that at confederation the tariff of Nova Scotia was only 12½ per cent., and then it was much higher than it had been during previous years. The St. John's *Telegraph* (N. B.), of June 17th, says: "What have we to gain—what have we not to lose by remaining in a union and under a policy that has brought us to this condition? This is not the language of mere complaint or fault-finding; we are not asking for sops and favors, we ask for justice, a trade policy under which we can live, otherwise the inexorable necessity that knows no law must determine our relations with the Dominion once for all." In the N. Y. *Times* of June 17th, the Hon. J. W. Longley, the Attorney-General for Nova Scotia, is reported as having said, "The Dominion represents a discontented and almost disconnected stream of Provinces." In the North-West the Red River Valley road is actually being built in defiance of the Government. The Winnipeg papers of June 22d represent Mr. Brock, on the Government side of politics, as having said in addressing the Hon. J. Norquay and colleagues at the close of a speech of no uncertain sound, "The people are ready to go to any extremity if they are forced to it." He was speaking as one of a deputation sent to interview the Government.

What the Maritime Provinces want is a market for coal, fish and agricultural products, and a share in the coasting trade. Give them this and they will be content; deny it them, and to get relief everything points in a direction of the snapping of the commercial cord that binds them in her uncongenial union.

It is argued as a reason for opposing commercial union that we should rather try and get some profit out of the vast sums expended in public works for the promotion of commerce between the Provinces. What profit will we get if the confederation cord should snap? Is it not wiser to adopt a fiscal policy that will allay the discontent of the confederates, stimulate commerce in all her arteries, and thereby make sure of increasing profits as the years revolve? But why do we thus run the risk of having the confederation fly to pieces? What is it for? Why, for the sake of a limited number engaged in the industries, the product of whose manufactures when exported summed up \$2,824,137 for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1886, out of a grand total of \$85,251,314, or about the one-thirtieth part of the whole. We admit they manufacture a large amount for home consumption, but to enable them to do this the farmer is first taxed by the country to protect them, and second, by themselves in the high charges they are thus enabled to put upon their goods. Why should we run all this hazard for the sake of a section of the community relatively so small? The preservation intact of the whole Dominion is surely a matter of more moment than the protection of one class of the community, who can get along well enough without such protection.

It Will Tend More than Anything Else to Stimulate Trade and to Develop Our Resources.

Although Canada is larger in territory than the United States, the latter has unquestionably the advantage in respect of climate, development, population and acquired wealth. The whole of her territory is accessible in one way or another during all the year, while a large portion of that of the Dominion is covered with unmelting snows. Canada has the advantage in internal means of water communication and in the possession of a more bracing, nerve-strengthening, and industry-producing climate, and we conclude we are safe in saying that Canada has decidedly the advantage in manufacturing facilities and natural resources. Her resources are the products of the forest, the mine, the sea and of the soil. In only a very meagre degree are any of these developed. While the total output from the soil in exports to the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1886, from Ontario alone, was \$15,495,935, the mineral export from the same Province was only \$3,115,696. Now this is but a small proportion compared with what it might and would be if there was opportunity for developing these resources. As it is, the market is restricted, and the duty of \$6 to \$7 a ton on pig iron shuts us out of the United States market. In Ontario we have no native coal for smelting, and on the bituminous from the United States, which would have to be used for the purpose, there has been a duty, till recently, which has added very much to the expense of this work. Notwithstanding that we have fine deposits of magnetic iron in Crosby, Madoc, Marmora, Belmont and Seymour townships, and in the regions around Port Arthur and the Lake of the Woods, for the present it must lie there, for there is a heavy duty on the ore if exported, and if but one smelting establishment, such as that at Cleveland, were to be sustained in Canada, it alone would suffice to supply the present wants of the country, which is but 250,000 tons annually. In such a case, our iron mines, remote from coal, will not pay the working, as in other parts iron and coal are found in conjunction. In the absence of a market all above this quantity must lie where nature has placed it, until we give up the ruinous policy of leaving our magnificent resources undeveloped for the sake of the interests of a fragmentary portion of our population. As it is with iron, so it is with copper and others of our precious metals. Bestowed upon us in value in uncounted millions, there they must lie, rather than be made the means of adding thousands to our population in mining them and manufacturing them for the various uses of life. And as it is with our mines, so it is with our fisheries. We have a home market for only a certain quantity, and the way is barred to the south of us. In the magnificent inheritance which Providence has left us, it is uncertain whether our treasures of the sea are much inferior to those of the mine, and those of the mine will not outweigh in value the products of the soil. The location of our great highways, natural and artificial, in reference to these

storehouses of agricultural and mineral wealth would furnish wonderful facilities for transporting these to any desired extent, if we only had an enlarged market for them, and the same holds true of the products of the forest.

The wonderful advantages of unrestricted trade between the two countries and the increase that might be expected to follow are shadowed forth by what took place during the old reciprocity period of 1854 and 1866, as already stated, when the volume of trade increased from \$20,000,000 in 1853 to \$84,000,000 in 1866. The volume of the trade fell off after the abrogation of the treaty to such an extent that not till some years after, in 1875, did it overtake the sum of the trade done in 1866—in 1875 it amounted to probably \$86,600,000. It is further illustrated by the trade in eggs. Until January 1, 1871, there was a duty of 10 per cent on eggs going into the United States, at which time it was removed. During the half year preceding, that is, from 1st July to 31st December, 1870, the total value of eggs imported into the United States from all countries amounted to only \$5,403. During the next half year the imports admitted free amounted to \$290,820. We now give a statement from the United States tables of the quantity and value of eggs imported from Canada, ending with June 30th of each year :

	Dozen.	Price.
1874.....	5,422,516	\$ 735,284
1880.....	7,662,068	894,349
1881.....	9,471,391	1,199,157
1882.....	11,728,518	1,793,167
1883.....	14,683,061	2,584,279
1884.....	14,688,338	2,356,313
1885.....	13,967,474	2,095,437
1886.....	14,469,764	1,893,672

This argument of the eggs is a very significant one. It informs us that without free trade in the last half of 1870 our export of eggs to the United States was less than \$5,403, and that with free trade in 1883 our export of eggs to the same country was no less than \$2,584,279—that is, that from 1870 to 1883, a period of only thirteen years, it had multiplied itself no less than two hundred and thirty-nine times. During the six years ending with 1886 they have brought us no less than \$11,922,025 from that country, which, according to the ratio for the half year already quoted, under the 10 per cent. tariff, would have amounted to \$64,836, or the one hundred and eighty-fourth part as much.

The trade in phosphates, almost the only mineral allowed to enter the United States free, also furnishes another illustration. The Union Mining Company, an American company, owning two thousand acres up the Ottawa, spent \$100,000 in plant, and after one year's operations declared a dividend of 30 per cent., and thousands of tons were sent across the border. Sweep away the restrictions on trade between the two countries and the hills that now are desolate, where one starts at the sound of his own voice, would be covered

with the villages of miners, the lines of transit would awaken to new life, ten thousand energies would be developed in turning the hidden nuggets of the mine into so many forms of usefulness, and an influx of population would come to us to stay, such as this country has never beheld in all its history.

The commercial union between England and Scotland in 1707 forms a parallel, with this difference, that the border line between the two countries by its conformation is much less favorable to the development of trade. While a narrow strip of mountain range separated these two countries, there are great stretches of water communication leading into the very center of the confederated Provinces, bringing them closer, as it were, to the different States of the Union for purposes of trade. There was the further difference, that England and Scotland were politically united, but this need not in any way affect the results flowing from the reciprocity they adopted. Prior to 1707 Scotland was excluded from free trade with England and her colonies. Goods must first be landed in England and duty paid there, and then be taken in English ships to Scotland. Leckey tells us that the only important industry at that period in Scotland was that of linen, and many of the Scotch people of the time said this trade would be destroyed and the Scotch shipping trade would be ruined; the poor people crushed by the richer, and the whole country would become one vast grazing ground. The English people said Scotch cattle and coals and linen, which were cheap, would sink their markets, and that Scotch labor would swamp the labor market of England.

But what were the results? Why, Paisley rose, and Greenock grew, and Glasgow rushed on apace; and such a tide of prosperity set in such as Scotland never dreamed of, making the Scotch people man for man, if we mistake not, the richest people in Europe, while England at the same time prospered all the more for the increasing prosperity of Scotland, and this is without a doubt what we might expect, in degree at least, from commercial union between Canada and the United States.

Why, we ask, is it that one city of New England has a population almost as large as the whole of Ontario and that the entire Dominion does not possess a single city with more than 200,000 inhabitants? Montreal has all the facilities for making a city great. She has abundance of water communication, is easy of access to the forests of the North, has communication by ships of the largest size with all the nations of the earth, if she so desires it, and can send her steamboats to the farthest shores of Lake Superior for purposes of inland trade. Her natural facilities for trade are far ahead of those of New York, and yet the one city can take the other easily under the shadow of her branches. Why must a Canadian stand in an unthrifty town at Windsor and look across the river at a city larger than any in Ontario, unless it be Toronto, and why is there but a collection of hamlets at Fort Erie, and a city nearly twice as large as Toronto across the river, the Canadian lake shore opposite being bought up for miles for summer residences for Buffalo's merchant princes? Will the opponents of commercial union tell us why?

It has been said that "trade, in order to increase and be profitable, must "be reciprocal." But there is one species of trade between the United States and Canada in which there is little or no reciprocity, nor will there be till we change our policy somewhere. We refer to the outflow of the most valuable commodity that we possess—the most enterprising of our people, for which we get no compensation. It speaks well of our social, educational and religious institutions, that our countrymen are so much in demand in the United States; but it speaks ill for our fiscal relations, that in a land superior to the United States in many of its natural resources, we cannot find employment for them at home. We have given New York one business man, of whom we heard it stated by a United States Senator that he was worth ten thousand. The business branches of this same individual number 114, most of them in the United States, and more than half the number of those employed in them, 3,000 in all, are Canadians. So it is in all the Union, many of the brightest and most promising of our men have gone over to the United States, because it gives them there a chance to rise on the stepping stones of opportunity. While this is all the better for them, it is all the worse for us, nor can we expect to become superlatively great till we find some means of keeping our most enterprising citizens at home. A process akin to this has left our farmers, compared to the other classes, in too many instances, hewers of wood and drawers of water, and so it will be down to the end of time, so long as they allow the most brilliant of their sons to leave the farm for other pursuits. Our Canadians, like the Jews amongst merchants and Scotchmen amongst the nations, have, amongst the Americans with equal chances, come to the front, which should be all the more matter of regret to us that we lose such men. But those who leave us are not to blame. When there is not work for all the sons at the old homestead, some of them must go, and feel assured whoever may see fit to go, it is not the laggards of the lot.

What a startling revelation is that of the American census returns since 1860. In that year the number of Canadians in the United States was 249,970, in 1870 it had increased to 493,464, in 1880 to 717,157, and in 1885 the estimate was 950,000, so that now in 1887, there are more than 1,000,000 of our people in the United States, while we, at the same time, have our agents ransacking Europe, and are even giving assistance to bring a much less useful class of emigrants to fill the blanks made by those who leave us.

The *Winnipeg Sun* of 17th July, says: "There are in Dakota this day "upwards of 30,000 Canadians who have filtered through from Manitoba and "the North-West." And the reasons given for this state of affairs as the result of personal enquiry were, (1) lack of railway facilities for the development of the country; (2) the pressure of high freight tariffs, and (3) the hopelessness of immediate relief from railway monopoly. The Athenians of old used to banish their fellow citizens by a vote of the people, but ours is a more modern and far less troublesome method.

Open up a market for our goods and we will not only keep our sons at home, but our resources will, at the same time, attract energy, industry, capital and skill, and there need be no doubt as to what would follow.

It will Greatly Benefit the Farmers.

That commercial union with the United States would be an unquestioned benefit to all the farmers in all the Dominion, few can be so uncandid as to deny. The farmers of the reciprocity period look back with lingering regrets at that golden age for them, when they sent their produce to the United States and brought back gold, which laid the foundation of their success. It is true that the American civil war was raging during a part of that period, which enhanced agricultural values, but allowing for this, it was a period of agricultural advancement such as they have not seen since, beyond all comparison.

Commercial union would benefit the farmer (1) by *cheapening* the cost of living; (2) by delivering him from the power of *monopoly*; (3) by giving him access to the markets of the United States, thus enlarging his present market *twelve-fold*.

When a tariff is levied on imports coming into any country, the price is enhanced to the consumer. It is argued that the artisan gets his compensation in surer employment, and it may be, increased wages, and that the farmer gets his in the building up of new centers of population, and the enlargement of old ones, thus creating an increased demand for the products which he has to sell. How far this is operative in Canada we have already shown. The census returns for 1880-1 give the whole number employed by the industries as 254,935. Now we must bear in mind that in the term industries is included all lines of material production other than agriculture. Many of them apply to the preparation of the necessities of life and to ordinary trades, as baking and blacksmithing, which are necessary in a country under any conditions, and are not in the strict sense of the term producers. And a large number are also engaged in handling agricultural products, as factory cheese and creamery butter-makers, meat-curers and others, to enable them to do which successfully requires no special tax. These, then, should not be counted in. Leaving them out, and allowing that many of the workmen have families, the whole number thus engaged, including employers and their families, cannot exceed 500,000, for a very large number of those engaged in manufactories are under 16 years of age, and a still larger number are unmarried. Take, for instance, the cotton factories. These together gave employment in 1880-81 to 975 men and 1,445 women—together, 2,420; and to 542 boys under 16, and 565 girls—together, 1,107. Now of the first class, a large per centage would be single, as this computation takes in all over sixteen, which makes it clear that our estimate of 500,000 is a reasonable one. Now the entire population of the Dominion at that date was 4,324,810. It follows, then, that all except the 500,-

ooo had the cost of their living increased for the benefit of the latter. Whether they got any adequate compensation for this has never yet been satisfactorily shown. We can conceive conditions where they might get this compensation by a vastly increased population, but this does not hold true of us. In 1881 the total amount of dutiable goods entered for consumption was \$91,611,604, and the tariff collected on the same was \$18,500,785. The rural portion of the community alone largely outnumbers the entire urban population. The proportions are at least as 3 to 2 in favor of the rural populations, as we will show further on. We leave it for our readers then to judge what proportion of this increased cost of living is paid by the farmer.

But it is argued that the manufacturers are rapidly adding to the wealth of the country by the increased value that they are giving to raw materials, and to make this the more impressive, they are quoted as having produced goods at that time to the value of \$309,676,068, but the amount in raw materials, \$179,918,593; plus \$59,429,002 in wages, must be deducted, making a grand total of \$239,347,593. The difference between this output and the value of the entire products, \$70,328,473, is an increase in wealth to the country so far. We must acknowledge this is a very good showing so far as the manufacturers are concerned. But it should not be forgotten that the farmers were taxed some 20 to 25 per cent. on many articles of consumption to bring this about, which modifies its value to the country. It is not only an increase of wealth to the country, but a very substantial increase to the wealth of those engaged in the industries, a return of more than *42 per cent.*, less running expenses, on the money invested. Allowing 6 per cent. on capital and deducting this amount, \$9,918,157, from the \$70,328,473, the gains, with the balance, \$60,410,316, those engaged in the industries made a clear profit of \$237 out of every one of the 254,935 work-hands employed, whether man, woman or child, and to whom they had paid on an average \$233 in wages. The interest allowed on capital will serve as an offset to the labor performed by those possessing the industries. When the farmers learn to handle labor so advantageously, our cities will be so completely drained of their populations that grass will grow in the streets and unbroken silence brood over the market places.

The farmers are in no way envious of the prosperity of the industries, or if they are, they should not be. But if they purchase this prosperity for the latter at a cost of more than two thirds of the sum of \$18,500,785 customs duties, as we have shown they do, they have a right to ask the reason why, as we have made it clear that the only compensation they get is the purchase of their products by the 500,000 representing the industrial classes, a large portion of whom would be engaged in these occupations without a protective tariff. If the farmer must toil laboriously with a return sometimes not over 1 per cent. on the money invested, and must be taxed to afford the manufacturer a return of *42 per cent.*, he is surely justified in asking the reason why. He has this reflection,

however, to console him, that he has put himself in this position, and the further reflection that he will remain in it until he lifts himself out. This state of affairs is indeed adding to the wealth of the country, and it is adding to the wealth of the manufacturer, although it is only fair to add that it is highly probable that the proportionate gains of manufacturers is less now than at the period to which we refer. We feel that our illustrations of fact here will be deemed extravagant. If so, we refer any who may conclude thus, to the census returns of Canada for 1881-82, vol. iii, paper 505, and ask them to make the calculation for themselves. Commercial union would not remove this entire tax, for there would still be a protective tariff against other countries, but it would greatly lessen it, and if an additional tax were wanted for managing the government of the country, it would be distributed on the shoulders of all who should bear it. We may conclude, then, that it would cheapen the cost of living for the farmer, by giving him opportunity to buy through his merchant in the cheapest markets of the continent, and at a lower price because of removed tariffs.

It would deliver him from the power of *monopoly*. Monopoly is one of the greatest curses that can come upon any country, and its evils are in proportion to its extent. It finds no countenance in any system of ethics as yet given to the world, and could not exist in any country where the sanctions of the golden rule, that most perfect regulator of all trade, holds universal sway. Yet even as regards monopoly, we must be careful to discriminate. It is often charged upon undertakings where *enterprise* is the more suitable qualifying word. The term will not fully apply to any business, however gigantic, that does not so control prices as to make them unfairly dear. It does exist in Canada and in grievous forms. Almost the only classes in the community not chargeable with this crime, for we regard it as such, are the rural portion of the community. We are not saying that this is the result of any clearer views of the obligations of human brotherhood that they possess, so much as the result of disabilities of opportunity. Owing to their isolation and numbers it is difficult for them to combine, while for opposite reasons, owing to their contiguity and restricted numbers, it is easy for those engaged in the various industries to combine. It is not wrong for any class to combine for the furtherance of common interests, providing this does not relate to a fixity of price. This should in every case be regulated by the natural law of supply and demand. The moment the demand will not justify continuance in a business on the basis of natural values, it is time to get out of it. Monopoly is one of the most gigantic cancers of the nineteenth century, which is preying upon the life tissues of one class of the community for the advantage of another class, without any corresponding weal to the general interests of the country. We have it in Canada in its worst form, owing to the restricted nature of our market and the limited number of our producers in the industrial lines. These monopolies, and even more those of the railway systems, are the famous Gordian knot that is going to puzzle the ingenuity of the farmers of this century.

There is no denying it, our industries have combined, almost every one of them. Some of these combinations have fallen asunder, not from the pressure of any outside opposition, but through the force of greed outcropping from within the combination itself. Combination is not easy in businesses that require but small outlay of capital to set them going. It is when large capital is required to their successful prosecution. And it is not necessary that those engaged in them have any written code formally drawn up and ratified. It is sufficient often to have a tacit understanding, with such variations as stringent customers must have before they will deal. In new lines of industries the consumers are liable to suffer most severely. When the manufacture of self binders was introduced, the price asked and paid was \$300 and upwards. This was not the result of formal combination, but of that tacit understanding that we referred to, and in all probability was brought about without any previous consultation, one knowing what the other was asking, and he asking as much. Better binders were sold last year in vast numbers for, many of them, \$125 each. They probably contained less material and less work than those which came out first and cost less to make them, but the firms making binders did well last season; their business flourished and the preparations for a still larger output the coming season are already going on. Now it follows that if \$125 to \$150, the latter the average price paid the manufacturers, pays, the \$300 charge for an article not much more costly, and in every way inferior, was extortion. Some argue that it is justifiable for one to ask and to take all that he can get. In such a case there could be no such a thing as extortion in the world, and the people would not be justified in cursing him who withheld corn when it was dear. Now as it was with self-binders, so has it been in numerous other lines, the farmers have been charged two prices, which could not have been had they had access to all the markets of the American continent. It is thus that the manufacturers have been enabled to lay aside their dividend of 42 per cent. (less running expenses) in 1881, and the vexatious feature is that the farmers have been taxed to put the industries in the position thus to extort from them.

It should not be overlooked, however, that in a sense the farmers are deeply indebted to that section of the manufacturers who have improved so immensely the implements of tillage. The manufacturers of these deserve to prosper, but there is a reasonable limit to the price that the farmer should pay. If the manufacturers of farm implements would content themselves with this, the farmers would be obligated to make them a magnificent feast at the annual recurrence of the Dominion harvest home, thus proclaiming it to the world that these were the men whom they delighted to honor, and whom they felt in duty bound to honor.

See the game of the sugar monopolists. We have but two refineries in Canada. The other portions of the community have been taxed to enable these men (1) to build palaces in Britain, (2) to enable them to enter into an iniquitous combination to raise the price. The arrangement ran thus: The

refiners would sell to the wholesale men only at a fixed price, the wholesale men to the retailers only at a fixed price, and these to the consumers only at a fixed price. Thus the consumers were bound with a three-fold cord of combination to enable those two gigantic firms of monopoly to put their hands in their pockets and extract money to enable them to build palaces beyond the seas. But two of the wholesale firms of Montreal, those of Lightboud, Ralston & Co., and Mathewson & Co., refused to be partners to an arrangement so infamous, and all Canada and posterity will honor them for the noble stand which they have taken. About the 20th August last they threw a bomb into the enemy's camp which filled it with consternation, by the importation of vast quantities of sugar from Scotch refineries, which was brought in over the high tariff wall against sugar in the hope of bringing the refiners to their senses, and we trust it will have the desired effect; but no credit to us farmers for this happy consummation.

The recent duties on iron are in the same direction, and the one firm in the Dominion, operating at Londonderry, Nova Scotia, have but to fix their prices only a hair's breadth below the prices of imported iron brought in in the face of the duties, and every blacksmith in Canada, and every farmer, is at the mercy of this monopoly. In spite of themselves they must bow down and worship this great image which is being set up in our midst.

The railway monopoly is the worst of all. Take the C. P. R. for illustration, and in but one instance. In June last the Manitoban was charged for the transit of wheat from Winnipeg to Montreal, 1,423 miles, 50 cents per 100 lbs. From St. Paul to New York, a distance of 1,420 miles, the rate was 32½ cents, a difference of 17½ cents per 100 lbs. in favor of the Minnesota or Dakota farmer over the Manitoban. The through rail and boat rates discriminate even more against the latter. While the rate from Winnipeg to Montreal, via Fort William, was 43 cents per 100 lbs., the same from St. Paul, via Duluth to Montreal or to New York was 17 cents, a difference considerably more than one half in favor of the Minnesota settler. The through rate from Minneapolis to Liverpool, via Duluth, was 29 cents per 100 lbs., while the same from Winnipeg to Liverpool, via Port Arthur and Montreal, was 55 cents, or 26 cents per 100 lbs., or 15½ cents per bushel against the Manitoban.

Let us show how this applies. We know a farmer of Cannington, Ont. (we can give the name), whose three sons have settled in Cass Co., Dakota, who grew 15,000 bushels of wheat in 1886. The seed reservation was 1,500 bushels, allowing 13,500 bushels to be sent to market. Now to send this amount from St. Paul to New York by all rail would have cost the owners less by \$1,417.50, as compared with the transit from Winnipeg by all rail; to have sent it by boat and rail, \$1,377.00 less to Montreal or New York, and to have sent it through to Liverpool, \$2,106.00 less, making a dividend in favor of each son in the item of wheat alone of \$472.50 in the first instance, \$459.00 in the second and \$702.00 in the third. Now the cost of transit west from Winnipeg

and St. Paul puts the Manitoban and his neighbor in the territories in a still worse plight, as the following comparison of rates will show :

A haul of	Miles	M. AND M. R.		C. P. R.	
		4 cts. per 100 lbs.		9 cts. per 100 lbs.	
"	100 "	10	" "	17½	" "
"	500 "	30	" "	39	" "

Who should blame the Canadian who goes west for preferring to pitch his tent beneath the Stars and Stripes, rather than under the flap of the Union Jack that he loves so well ?

In the matter of agricultural implements the Manitoban is no better off, for in 1886, according to the report of the Minister of Agriculture, p. 101, he had to pay from \$170 to \$195 for those of Ontario manufacture, or pay 35 per cent. duty for those of American manufacture. Now it is certainly a hardship for the Manitoban to be compelled to pay from \$35 to \$50 extra for every American binder he uses in that timberless country of his, because the binder is made beyond an imaginary line by his neighbor just to the south of him. Even this strong wall could not keep American machines out, for to-day in Manitoba they are very numerous used. We are glad to know that a number of our firms who manufacture binders do not fear American competition, and so are ready for commercial union, believing that they will get ample compensation for lower prices in the wider market.

Commercial union would bring the farmer an *enlarged market*, with all the advantages appertaining thereto. It would do this in almost every line of agriculture, unless in the items of corn in cereal produce, and pork in the line of animal produce. It is estimated that the United States exports agricultural produce annually to the extent of \$500,000,000, and it is concluded, therefore, that in the event of commercial union not only would the Americans not buy from us, but their goods would come down upon us in a deluge, and the competition would be more than our farmers could stand. But that this argument is easily refutable is clear from the fact that, notwithstanding the height of the existing tariff wall, the Americans climb over it and do buy from us in enormous quantities. In 1886 they bought from us to the extent of \$15,495,935, and in 1885 a still larger amount. The explanation is to be found largely in the excellence of our agricultural products, and their contiguity to the American markets where they are consumed. Now the fence is as high on their side as on ours, and if under a tariff that gives us no advantage on the whole, we can hold our own, why should we fear competition when these tariffs are removed ?

The most substantial benefits would flow to us. In 1885 and '86 Ontario alone exported to the United States 27,794 head of horses, valued at \$3,628,378 ; 93,096 head of horned cattle, valued at \$2,044,736 ; of swine, 4,004 head, valued at \$11,720 ; 588,163 head of sheep, valued at \$1,603,375, and of poultry and other animals to the value of \$291,516 ; in the aggregate sum-

ming up \$7,579,725. The duty of 20 per cent. collected on this amounts to, in the case of the horses, \$725,665; cattle, \$408,947; swine, \$2,344; sheep, \$320,675, and other animals, \$58,934; summing up \$1,515,934 in the two years. Add to this the duty of 10 cents per bushel collected on the 20, 178,877 bushels of barley for the same two years, sent from Ontario to the United States. This was valued at \$13,696,224, and gave a duty of \$2,017,887. We have, therefore, a total paid in duty on live stock and barley sent from Ontario of \$3,533,821 in the years 1885 and 1886, or an average of \$1,766,910 in one year lost to the Ontario farmers in their sales of live stock and barley; a larger sum than is brought into the whole Dominion by all the manufacturers through sales to the United States of their products. But this by no means represents the total loss to the Province. If the restrictions were removed the sales would increase, it may be in an untold ratio, and in addition to the increased sales the price would rise of what was not sold, owing to the increased demand.

That we are warranted in this statement is apparent from the stimulus given to the trade in eggs by the removal of the duty, which was about one cent. on each egg. The trade multiplied itself in value by 82, by the time that it had reached the tenth year of its unfettered life, and by 239 by the time that it had reached the thirteenth year—that is, the year 1883. It is unsafe to fix a limit which our trade with this people would not overrun, could we get free access to their markets? There might not be another line of the live-stock industry which would grow in equal proportion, but if many of the lines had but one-twentieth part of its growth, our exports would be enormous. If our trade in horses alone increased but the one-sixteenth part as fast as that in eggs, our export of horses would amount in the year 1900, or 13 years hence to 55,588 head; valued at, according to present prices, \$7,256,756. And if the export of all our live-stock increased at the same ratio, we would send to the United States in the year 1900 live-stock, to the value of \$15,159,450, to say nothing of live-stock products. Now, if the 10 per cent. duty on eggs had been made but 15 per cent., that magnificent trade, which is as beneficial to the customers in New York as to the Canadian producers, had never been. See what an enormous trade we might have in fowls. In Ontario we have at the present time no less than 6,968,915 animals. What a grand market would the manufacturing centres of New England make for these if we had access to them, but we are virtually shut out! At his speech at Dufferin Lake, July 1st, 1887, Mr. Wiman referred to the price frequently paid for broilers in New York as being \$2.00 to \$2.50 per pair. Many of the newspapers of Canada made the statement a subject of jest for days afterwards. As we think of this, we are reminded of the advice given by the sloth to the squirrel, when he said to the latter: "Hold, not so fast," for not only is wisdom always justified of her children, but also the converse.

In looking into a number of the *Washington Farmer*, bearing date of Feb.

22, 1887, for our attention an establishment of a commercial union at nature; and special number of the competition, as Now with special New York of broil-

There a Ontario conc tire Dominion States for the sold for the the quantity business in no saying particularly unrivalled. dant pasture in winter, a Viewed in t out unrivall may claim Canada in t swells that butter, and ing rills su in the line o Because the world—is s ada remark if we had c per pound i at present. market, wha United Stat it is near, an it is with o has captured States. Gi-

22, 1887, for information not at all connected with purposes of commercial union, our attention was arrested by an article on raising poultry in connection with an establishment in Michigan. That article had no connection with commercial union at all, as the date of the paper is prior to any real agitation of this nature; and was written for the purpose of advertising the paper, as it was a special number, and had a cut of a poultry house. It incidentally stated that some of the compartments were intended to raise "broilers" for the New York market, as they readily brought there wholesale from 40 to 45 cents per lb. Now with such a wealth of fowls as we possess, and 200 to 300 miles nearer New York than Michigan, how much might we not make in rearing and shipping "broilers"?

There are many agricultural products that we have not named to which Ontario conditions apply, to say nothing of the agricultural productions of the entire Dominion. There is the article of butter of which we exported to the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, only 111,388 lbs., which was sold for the humiliating price of a little more than fifteen cents per lb. In 1883, the quantity of creamery butter made in Ontario was 823,853, and the creamery business in Ontario, as well as in all Canada, is only in its infancy. There is no saying what dimensions it may ultimately assume, for our facilities, particularly in Ontario and Quebec, for the production of good butter are simply unrivalled. The conditions essential to the production of good butter are abundant pastures in summer, with full supply of clean water and shade, protection in winter, and a nutritious and varied diet, and skill on the part of the maker. Viewed in the light of these essentials, Ontario and Quebec Provinces stand out unrivalled amongst butter producing districts of North America. We may claim these two provinces as the dairymen's paradise. In Lower Canada in the month of June, where green pastures slope upward on the long swells that never seem to get to the top, the very grasses speak of milk and butter, and one almost envies the cows the purity of the waters that the dancing rills furnish them to drink. And what are these two provinces doing in the line of butter making for the American market? Nothing! and why? Because the market of the New England cities—the best butter market in the world—is shut out against them. We heard the largest butter maker in Canada remark not long since, that for every pound of butter he could make, if we had commercial union with the United States, he could get 40 cents per pound in the wholesale market, if made similar in quality to what he makes at present. Even though we got but 20 cents per pound and access to the market, what a magnificent trade would at once spring up in butter! The United States market would always have this advantage over the English: that it is near, and butter is rather a delicate article to ship long distances; and so it is with cheese. So long as we produced cheese as good as that which has captured and held the English market, we could get a market in the United States. Give us a chance, and as our hens have captured a creditable share

of the New York trade, and as our meat has forced itself over the United States tariff wall, so would our cows give us a place on the shambles of all New England cities for our butter.

We have not said anything as to our wool. The total clip for the Province in 1886 was 6,38,347 lbs., of which we exported to the United States but 1,287,984 lbs., valued at \$268,362, or not quite 21 cents per lb. With no duty every pound of this would have brought 10 cents more, and with the facilities that we possess for producing wool of a very fine quality, our market in wool would no doubt assume huge dimensions.

But some take the singular ground here that the Canadians do not lose the amount of the duty. The case is as clear as noonday. A Canadian at Fort Erie has a horse which across the river would bring \$120. A buyer from Buffalo steps over and offers him \$100, alleging as the ground of his inability to give more, that he must pay \$20 to get that horse over the river. If there was no tariff line that horse could be taken over the river at a cost of the ferry charges, and the Canadian would have \$120 as the price, instead of \$100 as now, and the effect would be on all the horses sold in the country, that the price would rise, all of which would be to the advantage of the farmer. But there might come a time when the advantages would not be relatively so great. For instance, the United States imports at the present time 48,000,000 pounds of wool annually. Now, until the growers in the United States and Canada together produced enough annually, the prices would keep up, the cost of manufacturing and the price of the fabrics remaining the same. There would come, as in the egg trade, a limit to the export, but that limit would be so far ahead of what it is now that every farmer in the country who thinks earnestly about the matter must long for the consummation of this treaty. But even in the egg trade, we do not know that it has reached its outside limit. In 1897 it may be twice as much as it is at present.

But the *relative* strength of the farmer numerically, and the extent of his interest in the country, should entitle his claims to fair consideration. In 1885 the farmers of Ontario were the owners of 21,775,299 acres of land, as returned by the assessors of that year. The total population of the Province was 1,784,960, and the urban population 369,152 outside of cities; the cities contained 289,254, so that the whole urban population then numbered 658,406; the rural population was 1,126,960, so that the country contained more than two-thirds of the whole population of the Province. In the same year the investment of the farmers, consisting of land, buildings, implements and live-stock, amounted to \$958,159,740. We do not know the amount of capital invested by the manufacturers in Ontario in 1885, but we do know that in the whole Dominion in 1880 and 1881, it was but \$165,302,623, so that now it cannot be more in Ontario perhaps, than \$100,000,000. We have, then, a total farm population of 1,126,960, against a total urban population of 658,406, and an investment of \$958,159,740, against a probable investment of the man-

ufacturers of \$100,000,000, nor should it be overlooked that of this urban population, not one-half perhaps are engaged in manufactures. If the Ontario farmers' claims do not get due consideration, he knows who only is to blame for it, and it is highly probable that the ratio of population in the entire Dominion is equally favorable to the farmer.

But it is objected that the farmers who have such large investments are doing "well enough," and therefore should be content. The time was when they did well enough; the time of the reciprocity treaty was one of those periods, and prior to that when the potash of consumed forests were feeding their lands, but these days are gone, and what with restricted markets and impoverished soils, taxes to make other people rich, and combinations taking advantage of them, with the depressed market prices, they are not doing well enough. They are not doing more than holding their own, unless it be in the improvements put upon their lands. If they were not hard-working and frugal and economical in every way, along with their canoe, the farm, they would go down the stream. The representation of the farmer in the cartoon of the humorous *Toronto weekly* was the grim irony of reality. The old man stood in his hay field garments, with a manufacturer on his head, a merchant on one shoulder and a middleman on the other, and a lawyer crawling out of his pocket. - We say it was the cruel irony of what is too real; but so long as he remains in this position, he has himself to blame. He has past the stage of childhood and is not in his dotage, and if his manhood allows him to rest under disabilities, the more shame for his manhood. In 1882, the farmers of Ontario were worth \$882,622,610, in 1886 they were worth \$989,497,911. The advance in these four years has been \$106,875,301, or an advance on the average capital invested for the four years, \$948,302,805, or .028 per cent., while the manufacturers of the Dominion made an advance of 42 per cent., less running expenses exclusive of wages, in the years 1880 and 1881; and yet they tell the farmer that he is doing well enough. Now anyone who knows anything about farming and the ways of farmers, must know that by the improvement of his lands, he makes the most of this advance. And it is idle to say that he has large sums of invested cash capital, for the farmer, above all other men, is prone to invest his money in real estate. The conclusion is irresistible, that commercial union with the United States will greatly help the farmer, by giving him a larger market.

It will Benefit the Fishermen.

No country in the whole earth is so well situated as Canada, in relation to the extent and value of either her fresh water fisheries, or those of the briny deep. The Dominion has more than 2,500 miles of sea coast on the east and on the west a line much longer, and in addition numerous inland seas and lakes, the fisheries of which are very valuable. In many places these haunts

of the finny inhabitants of the deep extend for miles from the shore. Indeed, so far away from land do they extend that they support a fleet of fishermen from the United States every year beyond the three mile limit, more numerous than used to constitute the armaments and merchant ships of the most powerful nations of the past century. These vast cultivable areas of the sea are in themselves a mine of wealth if properly farmed, and unlike areas of the soil, they will never become impoverished if only tilled at the proper seasons. The cold currents from the Arctic washing the shores of our maritime provinces, teem with minute forms of animal life which sustain these fishing grounds in undiminished richness, and are forever in their flow, so that while rains fail on the land and fertility fails, sterility on those vast sea meadows is unknown. Like the palm tree they are not only the emblem of perpetual productiveness, but the embodiment of it.

A people possessing such a heritage is indeed fortunate, for the harvest is prepared year after year without any effort on the part of men. The ancients used to say that in the golden age the earth produced spontaneously. With our fisheries it is always the golden age, for the harvest is always there with unfailing regularity, and the only precaution required is to make sure that the reaping does not take place at improper seasons. One acre of such fishing grounds is worth a hundred miles of unproductive rock, and very many acres of finest prairie soil, the deposit of the richest food-producing material of past ages. There is little wonder, then, that covetous eyes have been turned to those sea mines of constant wealth, and that the bordering nations have had great searchings of heart regarding their share of the spoil of these ocean treasures.

But of what avail is this magnificent inheritance of sea-food, unless there is a productive market for it? We might fancy a man on a lonely island, possessing a hill of solid gold, and yet, if the inhabitants of that island were few, it would avail him nothing, for gold would be of little or no service to them. In food products, if we have enough to eat, all beyond that limit is only a source of anxiety; if we cannot give them in exchange for something else, they are only vanity and vexation of spirit. The time was when people bordering on those seas could catch to their heart's content, and sell all they caught in the markets of New England, if they so desired, and get goods such as they wanted in exchange, buying in the cheapest market; but all this is changed. Now they can sell their fish there only in the face of a tariff of 30 per cent., and bring back goods again in exchange in the face of a 20 per cent. tariff, thus giving one-half of all they sell to the States, for the privilege of selling the other half. There is only one alternative, that is, to sell their fish for cash, and send the cash virtually 1,500 miles away to get dearer goods, the carriage of which they must pay for all that distance. They have a third course, and that is to leave their fish in the sea, nail up the doors of their fishing cabins, and move away to more propitious climes, or, if they do not move away them-

selves, encourage their sons and daughters to do so at the earliest opportunity, and that such is the alternative adopted by many of them is made pretty clear by the expenditure of \$150,000 a year to bribe the young fishermen to remain. Can we wonder that the people of those provinces have announced their decision to go out of the Confederation, if they can get out, and does it not sound ominous indeed, when any government resorts to the giving of a bounty to fishermen, or to men of any calling, to encourage them to continue in that calling? Mines of wealth lie beneath the Atlantic brine that laves the shores of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, and yet the fishermen are paid \$150,000 a year by way of bounty, to encourage them to persevere in fishing it out. We know hundreds and hundreds of our fellow farmers on a comparatively barren soil, who have paid for the privilege of farming it, in striking contrast to the fishermen, who were paid to till the sea. Give them access to a market, and they will need no bounty to induce them to continue in a profitable industry. The value of these fisheries is something enormous. The amount caught in the Dominion last year was valued at \$18,679,288, and including the 25,000,000 pounds used by the Indians of British Columbia, and the home consumption of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, would foot up \$22,000,000. The kinds of these fish are almost without number. In addition to some twenty-one kinds of commercial fish, enumerated in the report of the Department of Fisheries for the Dominion for 1886, there are numerous other varieties that are making rapid strides in the item of food consumption furnished by the sea. Fur seal skins, in which little was done till of late in Canadian waters, were obtained last year to the value of \$419,846, and the extent to which this trade might grow is practically without limit, so far as the supplies are concerned.

The nature of the Atlantic fisheries and their productiveness are too well known to justify dwelling upon them here, but we may notice that so important are they, that under present conditions they amply justify the expenditure of \$37,613 a year in their protection alone. Our fisheries, all told, employ a fleet annually of 1,113 vessels and tugs, of 44,605 tons, and no less than 25,137 boats, the whole manned by 55,731 fishermen, the major portion of which belong to the Atlantic seaboard, and the capital invested in the business is \$6,814,295. The fisheries of the Atlantic Provinces last year summed up \$13,737,579, and there is no saying to what extent these may not be increased by a judicious protection, while the fisheries of the Pacific may yet equal those of the Atlantic.

The fisheries of British Columbia are literally without limit along the entire Pacific coast, which is so studded with inlets that it gives no less than 7,500 miles of seashore, along which are numerous and safe harbors, the shore, Inspector Mowat says, is "studded with numerous islands, and lined with bays and fiords, some of which extend many miles inland, making harbors numerous, and safe for all sized crafts." The west coasts of Vancouver and Queen

Charlotte Islands teem with valuable food fishes," says Mr. Yondall, of New Westminster, "as well as with others which are valuable for various purposes of commerce." A boat can often be filled with black cod in a few minutes; a fish the flesh of which is excellent, but not much known to commerce. Then there are immense runs of herring, with halibut, octopus, trout, clams and mussels in myriads. The fur seals abound in immense numbers in many parts of Behring's Sea, inasmuch that the numbers on the hauling grounds of St. George and St. Paul Islands is estimated by Mr. H. W. Elliott at 5,000,000, ranging in weight from 400 to 600 lbs each. So immense is their numbers that it would take 25,000,000 lbs. of live fish to supply them with one day's food. It is proposed, in order to develop these fisheries to place colonies of fishermen, and encourage them with a bounty. It will all be in vain unless there is a market obtained, and the nearest market, and the best, because the nearest, is the United States. Halibut fish abound in these waters, but are not so good salted, and should therefore be sold near at hand.

The lakes and rivers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories teem with fish, and, of the catch of 1886, by far the largest portion, amounting to \$51,589, went to Buffalo, Minneapolis, Chicago, Detroit and St. Paul.

The rivers running into Hudson's Bay teem with salmon, and walrus are very numerous in the Bay, each one being worth \$60.00. The Americans are very busy prosecuting fishing in this bay, no doubt because they have a market in which to dispose of their goods. With reference to Canada, Lieutenant A. R. Gordon, in his report significantly says: "At the present moment, *no Canadian* is deriving profit from the resources of Hudson's Bay, except the few who may be shareholders in the Hudson's Bay Company." Why, we ask? So far as Canada is concerned, the walrus may revel in his home of brine, and the whale play in the white sea foam, or fall into the hands of the American fishermen, who have a market for their returns.

The temperature of the waters that abound in every part of the Dominion is peculiarly favorable to the breeding and production of fish on a stupendous scale. The tepid waters of Southern American rivers produce alligators and such like, while ours furnish whitefish and hundreds of other valuable kinds, which, if rightly guarded and developed, will prove worth millions upon millions annually. With whitefish eggs captured at the rate of one cent per thousand, and those of the pickerel, at one and a quarter cents, and scores of other kinds, at a somewhat similar ratio, and favorable feeding grounds for the young fry, the limit of production in our inland fisheries is bounded only by the limit of human application. Give us a Southern market for our fish, and the impulse will at once be felt throughout the entire fishing grounds of the whole Dominion.

Our country, with commendable zeal, is encouraging the propagation of fish in all our waters; would that we could say she showed a like zeal in the opening up of a market. Last year she spent \$44,038 in the promotion of fish

breeding, and with the most gratifying results, and when we reflect that the average number of eggs furnished by a salmon ranges from 4570 to 10,720 eggs, and other kinds in proportion, we need have no fear but that our fisheries will continually advance with proper management.

Of our fish, the Americans are by far the largest consumers. Of the \$6,843,388 exported during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1886, \$2,587,548 went to the United States, or more than 37 per cent. of the whole, forcing their way over a tariff wall of 30 per cent., and costing the poor fishermen, as we have already said, no less than 50 per cent. by the time he gets his goods back again. For 20 years the Nova Scotians have been trying to impress upon us the disadvantages of their position, and failing to get the desired redress, they are now threatening to take it into their own hands. And is there any wonder Listen to the testimony of an intelligent eye-witness, on the spot, a resident of New Glasgow for years, whose name we can give. He says:—

“The real fact is, that unless we can get some measure of reciprocity with the United States, we will be forced into annexation. We cannot go on under the present strain; the thing will break; we might as well open a steam bakery to feed a mouse as to expect to develop even the iron mines of Pictou County, by supplying the market offering in Canada for iron. If it was not for the market we have in the United States at present, even in the face of 15 cents per bushel on potatoes, 20 per cent. on horses, etc., and for the money sent home by the young men and women who have left the old folks on the farms, and gone to the United States to work—if it were not for these, our land would soon be desolate.”

Partial depopulation cannot but follow such a state of affairs. If young men and women are constrained to leave the land of their nativity to support the old folks at home in the steading or the cabin, “unoccupied” will be found written on the old farm house and cabin door when the old folks are gone, for young men and maidens are not going to return to rear the pillar of their homes in a country, the commercial disabilities of which forced them into banishment before they had reached their majority. The land which furnishes them with the means to smooth the declining pathway for the old folks, as they journey toward the realm of the setting sun, will be the land in which they themselves will live and die, and be buried, far away from the country that contains their fathers’ and their forefathers’ graves.

The question of the Fisheries is one that has vexed the currents of treaty stipulations between the United States and Canada, and more than once has almost plunged the elder and younger brothers of our revered parent beyond the sea into the horrors of a fratricidal war. There is less danger of this now than in the years gone by, for the Anglo-Saxon world is getting far wiser in this respect, as she advances in age, yet the relations on this question are always strained, and we grow no nearer to a basis of a satisfactory settlement, other than that which commercial union affords, than we were a century ago.

Give the people of the Maritime Provinces and British Columbia a free market for their fish into the United States, and the privilege of trading there, and give the Americans the privilege of access to our fishing grounds, on equitable terms, and the problem is solved. And we have many reasons for believing that in this way it would be solved by the people of those countries if permitted to solve it or themselves.

A 30 per cent. tariff one way, and a 20 per cent. the other is not enough to bar the trade between the Maritime Provinces and the United States. Like the higher and lower currents of ingress and egress of the waters of the Atlantic into the Mediterranean through the Straits of Gibraltar, the currents of ingress and egress from those provinces flows over and under the intervening tariff walls in a ceaseless stream, thus draining the sources of their material prosperity, till these have well nigh become shattered cisterns, broken and dry. For the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1886, Nova Scotia imported from the United States in the following items of breadstuffs for home consumption :

	VALUE.	DUTY.
Beans.....	\$ 1262	\$ 100
Indian Corn.....	54,224	8,433
Products of Indian Corn.....	202,801	33,642
Wheat Flour.....	58,765	7,291
	<hr/> \$317,052	<hr/> \$49,466

Quebec even fared worse. The flour she imported from the United States for home consumption cost her \$427,255, on which she paid a duty of \$54,323. Now, Ontario could have furnished all these save the Indian meal, but the opponents of commercial union fail to perceive that commerce, like water, will not flow upstream, and that where this is attempted, as in the case of water, it can be done only at an enormous outlay.

It Will Benefit the Lumbermen.

Canada will be famous for her lumbering when the timber supply of all other countries to the south of her shall have been almost completely removed. It is not that the supply in itself is exhaustless, but that the nature of the soil and climate where much of this timber is grown preclude cultivation that is profitable, so that when one crop is removed it is only a question of time and of protection from the vandalism of man and beast, until a slaughtered forest will resurrect itself, and reclaim its ancient domain. There are thousands of acres now, where the starving settler vainly tries to dig out a livelihood between large stones that are in everlasting possession, which would furnish a handsome rental to some proprietor wise enough to allow it to reclothe itself, and patient enough to wait for a return. She has her timber limits now, where every few years a crop of the largest trees are removed, soon to be replaced by young brethren. The day is coming when men will stand sentry in those lonely places

guarding this precious heritage from all intruders with a jealous care. The areas of country that can thus be devoted to the raising of timber are numbered by hundreds of thousands of square miles, so that it will always be a matter of first importance to Canada to have an unblockaded market for her exports of timber.

Although the giant trees—the pride of Ontario—are gone, and the lordly pines of the Ottawa Valley are no more, trees of nobler stature and forests equally magnificent and vast await the axe of the lumberman to the extent of thousands of miles on Rocky Mountain slopes, and in the recesses of British Columbia, where forests to the extent of probably 200,000 square miles are yet undisturbed. Across the region ascending to the height of land between Quebec and Ontario and Hudson's Bay, interminable forests still shade the rocks in summer, though the trees are less in stature than those of the south in other years. Lower Canada, south of the St. Lawrence, is pretty well stripped, it is true, but she has the capacity for growing thousands of acres; and the streams of New Brunswick still teem with logs of commerce in the rafting season. Within the domain of Canada there are no less than *ninety-five* species of forest trees, most of which may be utilized in civilized life, and hundreds of thousands of these are annually cut down to rot or to be consumed by the flames in clearing and other processes, because there are no manufactories sufficiently near to turn them into furniture, and this lack of manufactories is largely owing to the lack of a market for the furniture when made.

The lumbermen of Canada still drive an enormous business. The exports to the United States for the fiscal year, ending June 30th, 1886, were no less than \$8,545,406, and this was sent over in the face of a duty of \$2.00 per thousand, which was lost to the lumbermen of Canada. This is nearly the price of sawing the lumber, so that comparing the present state of things with a free market for lumber into the United States, the thousands and tens of thousands paid to the workhands, who sawed this lumber, were all or nearly all thrown away. If the manufacturers of lumber know the cost of putting their logs into lumber after they are at the mill, and doubtless they do, they will then have an approximate idea of what they lose every year by not having free access to the United States markets.

It would Give a Great Stimulus to the Mining Industry.

The mineral wealth of Canada is simply enormous. The amount of coal, iron, copper, nickel and other minerals deposited in her hills are beyond all estimate. It is very probable that the wealth of this country buried beneath its surface will outweigh the value of the surface soils, rich as these are over wide areas, and well adapted as they are to produce bountifully for man and beast. To read a summary of our geological reports sounds more like some fairy tale than the logic of sober fact, and yet we know the men who made the

surveys, Sir William E. Logan, Alfred R. C. Selwyn, Geo. M. Davidson, Alexander Murray, and their associates, held their reputation far too dear to risk its abrasion by the publishing of reports intended simply to excite and dazzle the imagination.

Not many years gone by, even we as a people more than half believed that when we got a little way to the north of the St. Lawrence in Quebec, and the height of land in Central Ontario, and that when we reached the north shores of Lakes Huron and Superior there was little else to be found than the dreary wilderness, which Divine Providence had given forever to the wild fox in his rambles and to the red deer as a browsing ground, but lo! instead we find mountains of iron and hills of copper. The rocks of the wilderness are impregnated with a wealth so profuse that the treasures of a Croesus sink into insignificance when compared to the wealth of a single square mile of this rocky surface, that can be picked up for \$2 per acre by any one desirous of investing. Why, then, is all this magnificence of wealth, a thousand times more than the national debt of the confederation, allowed to be undisturbed? Yes, that is it, will the opponents of commercial union tell us, why? A man might die a pauper and be buried by his neighbors, although he owned miles of this mineral wealth, so long as the market of the country would not pay him for disembowelling and preparing it for the market, which is just about our position as a country in relation to our minerals.

Let us look at this matter more minutely. Take the item of coal. The available coal of Cape Breton alone, not much larger than a good-sized county, is estimated at 800,000,000 tons. In Nova Scotia the seams of the coal, as Mr. G. Johnson tells us, are in some parts from six to more than thirty-four feet thick, and the area of the coal region of the Maritime Provinces is no less than 18,000 square miles. As to the N. W. Provinces, Dr. Geo. M. Dawson, of the geological survey, says, "The known area of true lignite coals of the best quality extends along the base of the Rocky Mountains from the 49th parallel to the vicinity of the Peace River, a distance of 500 miles, with an average width of, say 100 miles, giving a total area of 50,000 square miles." An additional area of 15,000 square miles, extending east as far as the Souris River, and Turtle Mountains, yields lignite of good quality. The estimated outcrop of eighteen miles of coal banks on the Belly River is 99,000,000 tons. The workable coal in the vicinity of Medicine Hat is estimated at 150,000,000 tons, the Horse Shoe Bend seam is put at 49,000,000 tons, and the Blackfoot Crossing seam at 270,000,000 tons. In the vicinity of the Bow River at Grassy Island, the estimate for one mile in width is 330,000,000 tons, or "equivalent to an output of 1,000,000 tons for a period of 300 years," and much of it lying so near the surface that the seams have been laid open and bare by currents of the rivers, and in hundreds of thousands of other instances the outcrops reach the surface along the Bow, Belly, St. Mary, Red Deer, and Old Man rivers, and throughout the intervening country. Nor should it be forgotten

that in the United States across the border there is a dearth of this material. Many sections of the Rocky Mountains are serrated with coal seams, which some day will be of inestimable value in smelting the metalliferous deposits which are known to be numerous there, and much of the coal is anthracite of the best quality. The Vancouver Island bituminous coal is the best in quality on the Pacific coast, and practically unlimited in quantity; and the tertiary lignite-bearing rocks of British Columbia are estimated at 12,000 square miles. The estimates of the coal areas as yet known put them at about 100,000 square miles, or covering a country more than 300 miles square, which gives us a coal field considerably larger than the whole of England and Scotland, and of greater extent than all the inhabited country in the Province of Ontario, while our consumption at the present time is only 3,515,769 tons per annum. Canada has coals enough to smelt all her mountains of iron and hills of copper, and to warm a hundred generations yet to be; but why should it be used in preparing iron or copper for a market which does not exist?

Iron is found in great abundance in many parts of the Dominion. The iron ores of Great Britain are, as a rule, less rich and not so easy of access as those of Nova Scotia, where the coal for smelting is found in close proximity, and limestone in great abundance. In the hills of central Ontario magnetic ores literally abound, one of which in South Crosby forms a bed 200 feet thick, but the silence of death reigns around them, for the duty on the export of the ore, and the carriage, are prohibitory. In the Province of Quebec are large and valuable deposits. There is a hill of iron not far from the city of Ottawa, which it is estimated would yield 100 tons a day for 150 years, and still be unexhausted. At the Hull or Baldwin mines not far from Ottawa on the Sagueney, the estimate is put at 100,000,000 tons, with 67 per cent. of iron in the ore. This would yield 100 tons of ore during every working day for 3,194 years. Hills of iron are found on Big Island in Lake Winnipeg. Great masses of iron ore exist in British Columbia, and lying in close proximity to the coal fields of Nanaimo. Magnetic, hematite and titanite ores of this precious metal abound in nearly all the Provinces, so that there can be but little doubt now that in this valuable metal Canada is to-day the richest country in the world. And yet in 1881, in smelting furnaces and steel making, we had but \$490,000 invested, and employed but 778 workmen, with an output of only \$914,769, while in a single state, Michigan, and by one iron mining company in that State, the Menominee company, the output in the one year of 1883 was \$24,000,000.

In the possession of copper ore, Canada ranks first amongst the nations. It is found in New Brunswick. Nova Scotia contains it in large quantities, "seven times as rich as the ore of the famous Hecla mines," and in conjunction with more than sufficient coal to smelt it. In the Eastern townships it has been traced in 557 locations. It abounds in many places along the Kingston and Pembroke line of railway. [Masses of it are found in

various parts of British Columbia, and the region north of Lakes Huron and Superior are supposed to contain more of this valuable metal than the whole of the United States. Yet the most of this stupendous wealth is lying undisturbed in the mines. A tariff of $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound on the ore on entering the United States, is a rather effectual barrier, and hence we read that operations in some of the mines in the Eastern townships "have been suspended."

While there is the stillness of the grave in many parts of that magnificent region on the north shores of Lakes Huron and Superior, witness the activity on the south shores in the State of Michigan. There the hills have been serrated and honeycombed; and the amount of ore crushed every day by the Calumet and Hecla company is no less than 2,200 tons. Although the ore yields but $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 per cent. of copper, not half so rich as that upon the north shore, the company during its existence of about 20 years has paid a dividend of some \$30,000,000, on an invested capital of less for many years than \$1,200,000. With all this wonderful activity, which is mainly responsible for the calling into existence of the town of Calumet, containing 10,000 inhabitants, the copper mines of the whole Dominion exported but 5,224 tons of ore to the United States last year, or less than would be crushed by the machinery of the Hecla mine in three days.

But it is not in these alone that our mineral wealth consists. Hundreds of millions of tons of nickel ore are found on the north shores of Lake Huron and in other parts of the Dominion; while the whole supply in the United States has been obtained from one deposit, owned by a single individual near Philadelphia, and yielding but .02 per cent. of the metal, Canada possesses enough of this metal to supply the continent for generations, but it must nearly all lie in the mines in the meantime, for the United States duty on it is 15 cents per pound.

At Thunder Bay and the Nepigon region north of Lake Superior and in British Columbia are valuable lead mines, also along the Kingston and Pembroke and Central Ontario railways, but it is left to lie where the past ages placed it, for the United States tariff against lead is more than half its value. Our mines of apatite are numerous and rich, particularly in Ontario and Quebec, and are the purest in the world. The United States admits this free, and a splendid trade has sprung up. Gypsum abounds in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and the North-West territories. The Ottawa Valley is a "huge storehouse of mica," and for this metal a variety of uses are being discovered. Salt abounds in Western Ontario, and on the Slave River in the North-West territories is a tract of country, which would take half a day to cross, supposed to be one vast deposit of salt. Then we have minerals, used as pigments, minerals for building, for grinding and polishing, and for a hundred other purposes in a profusion that is almost bewildering. We have marble and granite to build palaces for the living, and to stand sentinel by the dead. Minerals, such as are used in all or nearly all the arts requiring them,

that are known to any country, to say nothing of the immense wealth of our mines of gold and silver.

But what will all this avail us if we are shut out from a market? We can use these lavish gifts so lavishly bestowed, only up to the limit of our wants, beyond which they must lie in the mines where the agitated elements placed them, the only consolation left to us being the thought that they will not perish there, and that they will better serve those who will live after us, may be wise enough to utilize the markets of a continent rather than of a section of it. Multiply our present market by twelve, and what unparalleled activity would manifest itself over those wilderness regions!

E. Coste, M. E., in his observations on "The mining laws and mining in Canada" (see Geological and Natural History Survey of Canada for 1885) mourns over the want of development of our mines in the following language: "Why so little mining activity in this country, so rich in mineral resources, and in which so many mining regions have long since been discovered? Why have so many mining schemes failed, and why, in several parts of Canada, have good mines been abandoned, which will eventually be again worked with profit? How explain that several mining districts, where splendid discoveries were made years ago, are yet comparatively unexplored?" He endeavors to account for it in the fact that large tracts have been bought up by speculators, and held. It never seems to have occurred to the mind of Mr. Coste, that the true reason was a restricted market. Speculators always sell when there is a brisk demand. Thousands of acres of valuable mineral areas at the time of that writing were still unsold by the Government.

An attempt has been made by our legislature to stimulate the iron industry, but it can prove only partially successful. The degree of its success will be up to that limit, the extent of home consumption, beyond which it cannot go. We can ascertain that limit. In 1886, the imports of iron and steel and manufactures thereof, for home consumption, amounted to \$11,053,365; and we have already shown that the annual output of the Menominee Mining Company in 1883, was \$24,000,000, which did not include the after manufactures from the iron it produced. The total annual consumption of iron at the present time, is put by the minister of Finance at 250,000 tons, which would require to produce it 750,000 tons of ore, or but 2,396 tons per day; and we have already shown that the Menominee Mining Company reduces 2,200 tons of ore per day. The company, at present operating at Londonderry, have but to place their operations on a scale equal to those of the Michigan Company already referred to, and the output will supply the whole of Canada. This, they may easily do, for the capital employed by the former company has at no time exceeded \$2,500,000, notwithstanding the enormous dividends which they have made.

It is true, another company may start up in some other region, but the output can be no more than the requirements of the country, and so no more work will be done, and no more hands employed than if all were done by the

one company. But, give us access to the United States, which as yet largely imports iron, and we would have room for half-a-dozen such gigantic industries. Give us a market, and our manufacturers of iron could more than hold their own with the Americans, for coal and iron in immeasurable quantity occupy different compartments of the same house in Canada, on the shores of both the Atlantic and the Pacific, while the Americans have to convey their iron ore from Michigan to Pittsburg to get the coal to manufacture it, or vice versa.

By the change made in the tariff last winter, in the removal of or duty on anthracite coal for smelting, with a view to the development of the iron industry in Ontario, the revenue of \$497,000 was lost. The change may have been a step in the right direction, but until we get a wider market it will not avail, for our iron products cannot climb the United States tariff wall. The duty into that country on pig iron is \$6 per ton; puddled bars, \$16.00; bar iron spike rod, \$16.00 to \$22.00; thick hoops and sheets, \$20.00; thin hoops and sheets, \$28.00 per ton.

Not only must this stimulus soon reach its limit, as in the case with the cotton industry, but see who will pay for it, every consumer of iron in the country. The manufacturers of iron will have the regulation of the price, and all the additional duty, or nearly all of it, will be paid by the consumers; or, in other words, one industry of the country will flourish at the expense of a large proportion of the community at large.

The farmers are very large consumers of iron. It enters into the composition of almost every implement they use, and hence, as usual, the industries are made to flourish very largely at their expense. But care is taken that the machinery used in the construction of the works employed in those industries is admitted free. In this way, machinery to the extent of \$2,950,000 has been admitted free during the last two decades, while the farmer must pay full tale for the machinery which he may require, equally useful in its way.

The iron industry in the United States has made gigantic strides. The number of workhands employed yearly is 140,775; wages paid, \$65,000,000. the value of raw material, \$191,000,000, and the product \$296,000,000, while in Canada our workhands have barely got into the thousands, and our total output is as yet probably not more than one-thirtieth to the one-sixtieth part, for we have already stated that in 1881 our output in the manufacture of iron was but \$914,769.

This difference should not exist. During the last nineteen years we have paid out no less than \$13,326,869 a year for iron and steel, and the manufactures thereof, and we did all this, while millions and millions of tons of it lay undisturbed in the mines, coal in abundance, fluxes, labor, and half a dozen kinds of ore, but we labored under a fatal disability, that of a circumscribed market, and therefore the requisite capital in manufacturing has not come.

Sir Charles Tupper, in his budget speech of last session, says: "The development of this industry in supplying the wants of Canada, will give employment

to 20,000 men, and increase the population from 80,000 to 100,000, not including "the manufacturer of castings, forgings, cutlery and edged tools, hardware, machinery, engines or steel rails." He goes on to say, "were we to manufacture these articles now imported—and there is no reason why we should not steadily progress to that point—the population I have mentioned of 100,000 souls would be no less than trebled." Sir Charles is doubtless right. Add to this number the additional thousands that might be engaged in the manufacture of copper and nickel, under commercial union, in extracting petroleum from its caverns, and refining it, honeycombing the earth for marbles, soapstone, emery and one thousand other things. We might fairly look for an impetus to be given to manufactures such as this generation could never have hoped for under present conditions, and millions added to our population.

Its Effects upon the Industries Not Prejudicial.

Some persons argue that the adoption of commercial union with the United States will affect our industries adversely. Others maintain just as stoutly that it will be beneficial to them; that on account of the development of resources that will follow the opening up of a large market, such a stimulus would be given to them as had never been known before. Very probably both are right in a sense. There is but little doubt that there would be some derangement of our industries as they exist at present, or those who represent them, more especially those who represent the manufacturing portion of them would not be so strongly in opposition. Many of them have grown up under the shadow of a protective system, and like a son setting out in life who has learned to rely upon the successive instalments that come from home rather than upon his own efforts, they naturally dread the withdrawal of this fostering or pampering hand, we scarcely know which, and therefore array themselves in opposition. But it is not so with all of them. There is a strong and influential minority (we can give the names), embracing in their number some of the foremost, and we need scarcely add the most self-reliant, of our manufacturers. This is an argument that has not as yet entered very largely into the discussion, although it is one of much significance. If a strong contingent of the manufacturers would rather have commercial union for the sake of the larger market, then one of the strongest arguments of those who oppose the movement is removed. The secretary of the Manufacturers' Association of Ontario gathered statistics in reference to this feature. Why has he not published these? Are we not justified in inferring that so many of the answers were unfavorable that he concluded it would be impolitic to take this step?

The protective system can only operate beneficially under certain conditions. It is not equally well adapted to all countries. The economic history of Great Britain and the United States has made this unanswerable for all time. Protectionists who ignore these facts and try to make their system

equally applicable to all and to any conditions make a great mistake, for, carrying their argument to its logical conclusions in this aspect of it would render it advisable for each province within a State to adopt the system of protecting itself against each and all of the other provinces. In its application to the Dominion, the Maritime Provinces would erect a tariff wall against Quebec and against each other; Quebec against Ontario and Ontario against Quebec; and so of all the others. The policy of our Government has been the very opposite of this. It has constructed highways for trade in the form of railways and canals, at enormous expense, that the different provinces might be enabled to trade with one another; and, so far, it was in the line of duty. And did we possess a country lying geographically as the United States, almost any portion of it inhabitable, and self contained as it were in its resources, it might be profitable to continue the policy that shuts out the trade of outside nations. The United States furnishes the best example in all the world of the beneficial effects of a protective system and of one of free trade, in that she has protected herself against the outside world and prospered amazingly, and has at the same time enjoyed the utmost freedom in her inter-state trade, and the individuals of which she is composed have flourished equally well. Now the different Provinces of Canada, owing to their geographical location, contiguity to certain of the States of the Union, and remoteness from other members of the confederation, make it as clear as day that the natural channels of trade lie between them and the former, rather than between them and the latter. Such being the case, the conclusion is irresistible, that if a tariff wall around the United States, and the utmost freedom in trade between the States themselves, has led to the most wonderful prosperity of each State and of the country as a whole, by extending that wall around the Dominion, and allowing the same freedom of trade between the Provinces and the States of the Union individually and collectively, it would equally conduce to the prosperity of the whole country, especially when the natural resources of the one country are as good as those of the other.

The protective system can be operative only under certain conditions:

1. There must be a necessity for protecting industries against the competition of cheap labor.
2. There must be a similar necessity for protecting them from the power of large investments of capital, enabling those who have so invested to produce more cheaply through the extent of their production.
3. There must be a market.

Where the natural resources are equal or nearly so, and the labor conditions are very similar, the argument for the necessity for protection ceases. This argument shows the wisdom of keeping up our protective wall against England and throwing it down on the United States northern boundary line, for while wages of workmen in England are 25 to 50 per cent. less than in Canada, they are not in advance of those of the

United States, as will appear from the following comparison : In 1880 in the Eastern States, composing Maine, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, the average wages paid and materials used in a product amounting to \$100 was \$81.11. In the same year in the western States, including Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio and Wisconsin, the average was \$81.50, while in Ontario in 1881, the figures not being attainable for 1880, the average paid was \$77.05, so that in cost of production in producing goods to the amount of \$100 our people had the advantage over the States named of \$4.25, in itself a very satisfactory profit. Why, then, with materials which cost less, labor no dearer, better transit facilities, manufactories nearer the base of supplies, and a people whose natural abilities have enabled them fully to hold their own upon American soil, can our manufactories as a whole not hold their own against those of the United States?

The second reason is not so easily set aside. For a time it might react unfavorably to the weaker of our manufacturers, but only for a time, for as firms grow strong, and there is opportunity, it is the tendency of things for them to create branches where a market opens, and so save the expense of transit long distances. Thus it is that Scotch firms have planted manufactories in the United States and Canada to supply the trade in sewing cottons, and it is an open secret that even now some of our largest establishments are run by American capital. There is no saying to what extent this would be done in this country under our protective system, were it not that the absence of a market forbids it.

Certain it is, that this difficulty has been overcome in the western States, and also in those of the South, where, since the war, manufactures are rapidly growing. The New England States were strongly entrenched behind their flourishing manufactories long before those of the western States had a being, yet it cannot be denied that those of the west and south are now flourishing beyond those of the east. It is idle to say that eastern capital has done all this, for, though it had, the benefits of the manufactories established in these new centres flow out in all directions all the same. The matter of prime importance is to get manufactories, let the capital come whence it will, where there is a market to sustain them.

Compare the growth of Ontario with that of Michigan, and it will be found that Michigan has a decided advantage in the tale of development she has to tell, although Ontario has a long way the advantage in her natural resources. In 1810 the population of Michigan was 4,762, that of Ontario 77,000. In 1881 the population of Michigan was 1,636,937, and of Ontario 1,920,337; but observe that while the increase of population from 1840-50 in Michigan was 185,000 against 518,000 in Ontario, from 1870-80, the increase was 452,000, as against 302,000 in the latter. The manufactures of the two States during the same period compare thus :

Value of manufactures in Ontario in :

1881.....	\$157,989,870
1871.....	114,706,799
Increase.....	43,282,071
Michigan.	
1881.....	\$150,715,625
1871.....	94,716,741
Increase	55,998,284

In Ontario the rate of increase was but 38 per cent.; in Michigan 59 per cent. In Ohio during the same decade, 61 per cent., and in Illinois 152 per cent. Now all these States had no protection the one against the other, nor had those of the west as a whole any protection against the older sections of the east, and yet they left our banner Province so far behind in the race, that the comparison must bring the crimson to the cheek of any high-minded Canadian.

Now while it may not be an exact parallel to single out one State from the other States of the Union, as it might be objected that there are phenomenal reasons for its growth, there can be no such objection in comparing growth in one group of States with growth in another of them. Yet in the comparison we have made between Michigan and Ontario, the latter had the advantage in almost every sense of the term. A comparison of the progress of the manufactures of the Western States, with those of the east, which had grown strong in the development of a full manhood before the others had been born, will show how little Ontario has to fear from American competition, for it cannot be said that the industries of Ontario are in their infancy now. We shall represent the Eastern States by Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania, and those of the west by Illinois, Ohio and Michigan. The comparison stands thus :

VALUE OF MATERIALS.

<i>Eastern States.</i>	<i>Western States.</i>
1850..... \$ 307,718,822	\$ 49,773,674
1860..... 503,344,480	122,994,663
1870..... 966,141,686	282,299,431
1880..... 1,531,605,763	598,078,434

VALUE OF PRODUCTS.

<i>Eastern States.</i>	<i>Western States.</i>
1850..... \$ 550,386,153	\$ 90,395,553
1860..... 924,538,049	211,840,390
1870..... 1,640,801,251	474,984,167
1880..... 2,456,650,325	913,878,088

PER CENT. OF INCREASE IN PRODUCTS.

<i>Eastern States.</i>	<i>Western States</i>
1850-60..... 66	134
1860-70..... 77	124
1870-80..... 50	92

The reason for this state of things is surely plain. In the west there was a large market, which the descending ratio of the percentage of increase in the west proves, for we have no doubt but that if the facts were fully known the ratio of increase in population, or in other words, the area of the market, has not kept pace with the development of the manufactures.

It is idle, then, to expect any very great development in our industries, other than we possess, unless we get a market. It can only keep pace with the slow development of the country under present conditions. Progress, then, must be laboriously slow, for while our population is filtering away half as fast as it comes in, our country cannot develop rapidly. So long as in our inter-provincial trade we are content to journey over the two sides of the triangle rather than take the third side, we must suffer the consequences. Manufacturers in the Western States must leave those of ours in the North-west quite in the shade, when the rate of increase in the population is so different. Six years ago it is said that the population of Dakota and the North-west were equal, now that of Dakota is 600,000, and of our North-west about 150,000. Amid such conditions plant manufactures in the North-west and protect them with a wall over which none can climb, and feed them with bonuses until they are nauseated, and tax the farmers to enable them to add monopoly to the bonuses, but give them no outside market, and manufacturer planted in a State developing like Dakota will leave them nowhere.

No, we must draw the line carefully between protecting an industry and fostering a monopoly. It is the mission of protection, as has been well said by one of its best friends on the continent, the Hon. Mr. Butterworth, "it is the mission of protection to guard infant industries against unequal conditions of competition, but not those full grown and able to take care of themselves." The principle of protection is only operative until the demand is filled, then the manufacturer must stay his hand until more is wanted. We have ample evidence of this in our midst. This has already led to periods of suspension in the operations of our cotton mills, and to the adoption of the plan of running on partial time in others of our industries. Plant but one establishment such as the Cleveland Iron Works in our midst, and the product is sufficient for the wants of the whole Dominion. In a market that is easily glutted there is small encouragement for capitalists to invest their money, knowing they can only go so far, when the limit of profitable production is reached. The Protectionist should not forget that "when he shuts out a competitor by his walls, he shuts in his own market, and the walls may soon become too narrow." Prof. Goldwin Smith has said "the necessary effects of the protective system in Canada are misdirection of capital and industry, financial deficit, dearness of living, and consequent depopulation," conclusions which are amply verified in the condition of our country to-day.

Until the doors of the other markets are thrown wide open to us, we need not expect a large inflow of capital, nor the planting of new industries in our

midst, especially those of a character which can easily supply the market under the present conditions. Take the manufacture of needles, for instance. One establishment of this kind, well equipped, would suffice to supply the whole Dominion in the course of three months, and would have to shut down for the remaining nine months of the year. Where is the capitalist in the face of this fact who would care to invest his money in the manufacture of needles, and so of other branches of manufacture?

The strong arguments adduced in favor of protecting our industries are (1) that they increase population by affording employment for the workmen, and (2) that they thus benefit the farmer by causing an increased demand for his products, or in other words, by furnishing him with a better home market. There can be no question of the truth of the first proposition up to a certain limit. So long as it can be shown that protection has a tendency to increase our manufactures, this argument is so far valid, but if there come a time when it can be shown that protection has the opposite effect, then it may legitimately be used as a weapon against itself, a gun that may be employed in the demolition of the protection wall. We hold that that point has been reached in the history of protection in this country. It has already fulfilled its mission, and, like the swaddling clothes that protect the infant, should be thrown aside when it has outgrown their use. Stagnation is brooding over the waters of our manufacturing stream; open to us the markets of the United States; a first effect would be motion on those stagnant waters; a second, life, as the result of motion, and a third the influx of a stream of prosperity as the result of life, and the influx of a busy population in numerous centres as the result of prosperity.

That they benefit the farmer in a sense is evident, but it is a benefit for which he may be made to pay too dear. If he is made to pay 25 per cent. more for what he buys from abroad, then his gain is a very doubtful one, and if, by doing this, he is putting the manufacturer in a position to tax him, it may be this amount extra on the goods he sells him, or even half this amount through combination to fix a price, and only gets in compensation the small increase in price for his products, which the small increase in population gives him, his gains are most assuredly on the wrong side.

To illustrate in another way: In 1881, the number of farmers in the Dominion was 464,025. The number of servants employed by them could not have been less than twice that number, and, allowing in addition for children, the rural population, according to the proportion based upon Ontario returns for 1885, could not have been less than 2,729,546, out of a total population of 4,324,810, or more than two-thirds of the whole.

The number of workmen employed by the industries of all kinds was 254,935. Now, without protection this number would still have been pretty large, for we had manufacturers who had become millionaires before the introduction of protection, and who employed large numbers of men. The advantage to the farmer, then, would be the increased purchasing power of the

additional workhands which protection brought, and their families, so far as the farmer's products were concerned. The revenue collected that year from goods imported from the United States for home consumption, amounting to \$36,704,112, was \$5,657,292. If our estimate of the rural portion of the population is correct, it paid more than two-thirds of this sum for the protection of the manufacturer, and was shut out from a market to the extent of \$36,866,225, unless by climbing over a high tariff wall to get access to it. There need be no doubt here as to who had the advantage.

Protecting the industries of a country where the market is prescribed, gives them every opportunity of combining. This is one of its most pernicious features. With the increased duty on iron, the smelters thereof owing to their limited number, can easily combine and put up the price of their goods to the line of tariff admission, and who shall say that they must not? So it is in a hundred other lines. The rural portion of the population is taxed to support all this, and worse than all, in the outlying Provinces a double tax is put upon them in extortionate rates, which they are forced to pay, because of the lack of competition. It is, therefore, absolutely indefensible to say that a customs line is necessary from sea to sea, to sustain our industries, when results so injurious to the rural populations are the result. The consumers of any one article should not be made to pay an artificially enhanced price for it, unless you give some adequate compensation, which shall increase the purchasing power of the consumer. This has not been done in the case of our rural populations, who, owing to their numbers and the importance of their work, are surely entitled to as much consideration as the other class.

Why talk about "sacrificing" our industries by the adoption of commercial union? Is not the sacrifice nearly all the other way? The exports of Ontario in 1886 to the United States, are as below:

Products of the Mine.....	\$3,115,696
" " Sea.....	2,587,548
" " Forest.....	8,545,406
Animals and their food.....	6,742,789
Agricultural products.....	8,753,146
Manufactures.....	1,758,707
	<hr/>
	\$31,503,292

Here, then, we have those who export to the extent of \$29,744,585 taxed to uphold those who export to the extent of \$1,758,707.

It may be urged that the manufacturers produce very much more largely than they export to the United States, for home consumption. So do the other classes, notably the farmers, who at the same time have to pay the manufacturers more for their goods than if there was no Southern customs line at all, for in such an event they would have things less their own way.

We want the industries. We want them two-fold more than we have

them ; yes, three fold. No country can thrive so well without them. We want them protected where it is necessary, as against cheap European labor, but do not want them at the expense of the sacrifice of the interests of another class which far outnumbers them, and which have at least an equal right to a fair share in the prosperity of the commonwealth.

If the farmers of Ontario are not afraid of the competition of the farmers of the United States, why should manufacturers be more faint hearted than the farmers ?

The total value of the live-stock of the United States on January 1st, 1887, was \$2,400,586,938. That of the live-stock of the Province of Ontario at the same date, was \$107,208,935 ; and yet not a man amongst the farmers is dismayed at the prospect of competition with the United States in live-stock, although the interest of the former is more than twenty-two times that of the latter.

Again, the United States had, on the 1st day of January, 1887, cattle to the value of \$29,216,900, and to the number of 48,033,833 head. Ontario farmers do not for a moment fear this competition, although their bovines all told numbered only 2,018,173 head at that date. Notwithstanding, in the two previous years, the farmers of the Province sent over to the United States no less than 93,096 head, valued at \$2,044,736, in the face of a tariff of 20 per cent., and they are quite confident that if they can do this in the face of a tariff, they can do a good deal better in its absence. Are the manufacturers of Ontario, who breathe the same air as the farmers, feed upon the same products, are nourished by the same institutions, are protected by the same civil privileges, and have comparative advantages in every way equal to those of the farmers, going to acknowledge that the courage of the sturdy farmer is to be allowed to put them to shame ? All honor to our sturdy Canadian yeomanry, that they have demonstrated to the world, that under all the disadvantages that press upon them, they are able to hold their own. How much better would they not do if they had equal chances ? While the minority have their rights, they should never overshadow those of the majority. If commercial union should injure the interests of some of the manufacturers, we should be sorry indeed ; but if by not getting it, we shall injure the interests of a far larger number of the farmers, then the way of duty is clear. If there is no other way to arrange matters, it would be better by far to give 1,000 of those controlling certain industries a liberal pension, than to tax all the consumers in the state to sustain them at the expense of barring the way to freedom of trade with no less than 60 millions of people.

The Charge of Disloyalty Untrue.

This charge has been borne down upon those who favor commercial union, with a persistence worthy of a better cause. When we think of the character of the men against whom it is urged, we cannot but conclude that those who

bring it know very well that it is only a hollow cry. Can it be true that the president of the Central Farmer's Institute of Ontario, a man who has done more for the honor of Canada in the live-stock interest, than it may be any other man in it, is disloyal? Are the farmers who have declared in favor of the measure, including in their numbers many of the most intelligent of the guild, disloyal? Why, these men have helped to make the country what it is. Can we conceive it possible that these have no concern for the individuality of the structure they have helped to build, and for its highest prosperity? Are the forty gentlemen of the Toronto Board of Trade who declared themselves in favor of commercial union, all unloyal to Canada, any more than the sixty-three who voted against it? This cannot be, for the minority includes the names of some of our most active and influential citizens, and if the supporters of commercial union are all disloyal, woe unto Canada, for the infection has become most widely spread. It extends to all the provinces, and the foremost of our public prints are the gravest offenders? Viewing the matter in the aspect of provinces, can it be that the only province truly loyal to British connection and to federation is Lower Canada, for she is the only province as such which has shown any unanimity in the extent of her opposition. Her newspapers, with one single exception, a solitary light in a sombre sky, are opposed to it, and there can be but little doubt that these voice the sentiment of the people. How changed the times! The descendants of those who bled and died to give Britain the brightest gem in the crown of her queen are disloyal, and the only loyal province in the whole Dominion is that inhabited by a people alien in race, in religion, and in their ultimate aims. Side by side with these, the opponents of commercial union may take their stand as the only true representatives of Canadian loyalty. We shall not grudge them their position.

But what is disloyalty? Those who are so expert at flinging the term as a stigma in the face of all who favor commercial union should first ascertain what it means. In this sense all will be agreed, that loyalty implies fidelity to one's country. It is only a half definition which would constitute it fidelity to one's sovereign and government, for the true interests of a country are often antagonistic to the policy adopted for the time being by the rulers of the land. If this is not true, then John Hampden and all his followers were traitors, and the Royalist party were the only patriotic men in England, and the leaders of the American Revolution were execrable men. It follows, then, that the only truly loyal citizen is he who seeks, so far as in him lies, the true prosperity of his country. A man may be disloyal to the existing state of things in the land in which he lives, and yet in no sense disloyal to that land. Were it otherwise, reforms could not be brought about, nor would progress be made. Now disloyalty is the converse of all this, hence in this disloyal cry the commercial union advocates are charged with *not* seeking the advancements of the true interests of the country. Let us see,

We have shown that commercial union, if obtained, would help all our farmers from sea to sea, that it would send such a life throbbing through all the arteries of trade as was never felt before, that it would give our lumbermen one fifth more than they now obtain on the products of the forest, that it would tend to the development of our minerals in a degree beyond what the most sanguine are now looking for; that it would calm the disturbed waters of the fishery seas; that it would add fresh strands to the confederation rope that is now strained almost to the point of snapping; that it would bring in fresh industries, and build up new centres of manufactures; that it would give the Canadian farmer 10 cents more on every bushel of barley he sells to the United States, and add one fifth to the price of every cattle beast, sheep and lamb sent across the line; and that it would cheapen very materially for him many articles which he needs must purchase, and yet for seeking to obtain these great advantages which must prove a great blessing to the State, and to nearly every person within it, our people are called disloyal. Surely when that cry is heard again it will emanate from some hidden covert, where a sound will be heard, but nothing visible will appear.

If loyalty implies that the Canadian farmer must be taxed to help to build up the industries of Canada, and then taxed in turn by the industries for doing it, and be shut out from one of the best markets in the world to accomplish this, thus placing his bark upon a current so adverse that he cannot make headway against the tide, who would blame him for being disloyal? If loyalty means that the lumber men of Canada must not seek to obtain an addition of \$2 per thousand on the \$8,545,406 in the products of the forest which they are now sending to the United States annually, then who should blame the lumberman for being disloyal? If loyalty implies that the fishermen must content themselves with 30 per cent. less on the \$2,597,548 in fish which they send annually to the United States, then why should the fishermen not become disloyal? And likewise the miners who sent to the United States in 1886 products of the mine to the extent of \$3,121,696. If loyalty signifies that our manufactures must be confined to a market so narrow that, like a cancer, it is preying upon their energies and debars development, then why should not these become disloyal and try to move away from beneath the upas tree where they are now sitting? If disloyalty implies that the Maritime Provinces must trade with Ontario and likewise Manitoba, coming 1,500 miles for goods that could as well be had within one third of the distance, and that there must be an inter-trade between all the Provinces in channels that were never intended by nature, then why should not all the people of the Dominion become disloyal? Nay, these men who are loudest in the cry of disloyalty, know very well that they are using the term disloyalty instead of patriotism, that there is hypocrisy in the very tone in which it is uttered. If one party is loyal, the other must be disloyal. Now which is it? We have shown that those who are seeking commercial union seek their country's good, therefore they

cannot be disloyal. We have thus parried the blow aimed at the commercial unionists, and it should be given back on those who send it. Read in the light of futurity, the efforts of those who are striving to build high the temple of their country's true prosperity will be regarded as true patriots, while those who are trying to thwart them in their efforts will have graven deep upon their headstones, *dis-loyalty*—when it shall be beyond their power to erase the stigma that will go down with them to all generations.

The Annexation Cry Foundationless.

Those who are seeking commercial union with the United States have been charged with seeking what will in the end lead to annexation. The argument stands thus: The party opposing commercial union say that its adoption is certain to lead to annexation. That favoring it asserts as stoutly that commercial union will indefinitely postpone annexation; nay, that it is the only thing that will avert it. So that in enunciation of statement, the parties are equal: not so in the presumptive evidence supporting these views, as we shall see, and most of the evidence is of this class.

If this must follow commercial union as a matter of course, then it is a dangerous thing for the political stability of States to have intercourse with one another in matters of trade. It is a common occurrence to incorporate States by the sword or by purchase, but we cannot call to mind a single instance where one State merged into another, as the sole result of commercial intercourse. If this is the sure result, it is certainly a cheap and a humane way of securing incorporation, and the great pity is that the world did not find it out ages ago. The ties that bind people together politically are not those of commerce, but a common language, relationship, and a similarity in religion. Observe that political union is not essential to the happiness or prosperity of nations, but commercial union is essential to both, when the conditions are very similar. "All the advantages that would be possible to a political union " would be possible to a commercial union, and hence the *cause* for a political " change is entirely removed." And this is one principal reason why the advocates of annexation look coldly upon the commercial union movement: it takes the stock argument away from them—the commercial benefits that would be sure to follow.

If the people of the United States showed a craving for enlargement of territory, there would not even then be a shadow of reason for believing that Canada would lose her political identity, for no State can pacifically lose its identity without the consent of a majority of its own people. The United States has shown no such desire, but on the contrary they not long ago refused the rich and populous island of St. Thomas and the republic of San Domingo, in both of which the people had voted for annexation. So that we have no guarantee that the United States would take us in, were we to vote for annexation to-morrow.

Alaska was only reluctantly accepted, as stated by Senator R. R. Hitt, of Illinois, after the United States had bound herself in a compact with Russia. They, no doubt, feel that the work they already have in hand in assimilating the diverse elements in their midst, will be ample for them. It is concluded by most who have given the question serious thought, that commercial union would tend very much to promote the prosperity of Canada. Now, the effect of prosperity is to make people contented with their condition. Why increased prosperity should make the people of Canada disloyal to Great Britain is not very clear, and why it should make them desire to be annexed to the United States is equally obscure.

It is well that we should look this matter straight in the face. Those who so lustily join in the annexation cry would be much better employed in taking soundings to ascertain how near the rocks we are already. The physician finds it useful to feel the pulse of his patient ; so it may be useful to the physicians of our nationality to feel the pulse of disaffection, which process cannot but alarm them as to the welfare of their patient.

During the reciprocity period, from 1854 to 1866, there was no word of annexation. At the time of the Fenian Raid, about the close of the period, a man was heard in a Western town of Ontario to utter sentiments that savored of annexation. The first result was a shower of brickbats, and the second that the newspapers all over the country held him up to execration. What are the facts now ? Why, in all the Provinces, men are found who take no pains to conceal their annexation views. Not long since we heard one of the shrewdest business men in Hamilton, Ontario, remark, that if a vote were taken in that city and men all voted in accordance with their convictions, a majority would vote for annexation. That gentleman may be mistaken in his opinion, but allowing this, its expression goes far to show the extent of the annexation sentiment in that city. The *Farm and Home*, Springfield, Mass., recently asked its subscribers to vote *yea* and *nay* in regard to the question of annexation. Out of 910 answers, 210 were cast *yea* and 700 *nay*. There are newspapers in our midst who openly advocate annexation, and their proprietors, instead of faring like the poor unfortunate at the time of the Fenian Raid, are being honored with seats in Parliament.

We need not shut our eyes to the fact that, if the Maritime Provinces go out of confederation, and at the last local elections Nova Scotia clearly expressed her mind in this matter, they will go into the Union if they can get there. If Manitoba and British Columbia are not allowed to build railways which will give them ingress to the great republic, the confederation is likely to be split in twain at Lake Superior, and the Provinces will seek that political connection which will best suit their interests individually. Now commercial union cannot be responsible for this. It has been a development not of a day, but of years, and like every other development proceeds from a cause. And what is that cause ? Will the opponents of commercial union tell us ? If not,

we will allow the *Emerson International* of July 21st to answer, for there is no doubt that it gives us the true key of solution, when it says: "The opportunity to free channels of trade is rapidly engendering a strong and wide spread feeling in favor of annexation."

The extent of this uneasiness should lead our rulers to ascertain its cause. Why has a desire so widely spread, so deeply rooted, and that is propagating itself with race horse speed, got so firm a hold upon the people of Canada? When people are prospering fairly well, they are usually contented. It is when they are laboring under disabilities that they get uneasy and desire change. There can be no stronger evidence than this growing desire for annexation affords, that the trade relations of this country are out of joint and want readjusting. Hence all patriotic citizens, and all who desire the integrity of the confederation, and the continuance of present political relations with Britain, cannot be too prompt in seeking and applying a remedy.

It would be strange indeed if a desire for annexation, that had become deep rooted and widespread because of the want of commercial union, would be fanned into an irrepressible blaze which would entirely consume our distinct nationality, because of the possession of commercial union. The material which forms a bar can never be made the material to form a channel.

There can be no reasonable doubt, then, that if the grand old British Lion is to retain his position where he keeps vigil at Quebec, there must be some change. The feeling of disaffection has nearly all grown up since the time of the Fenian Raid, but most of all in recent years. While our rulers have substantially remained the same, our fiscal system has changed, and instead of quieting the politically discontented, it has had the opposite effect.

Commercial union with the United States seems to us the only measure that will stave off annexation, and it is most likely it will stave it off for all time. The annexation party perceive this, and they are therefore not over enthusiastic in their advocacy of commercial union.

Mr. Ellis, editor and proprietor of the *Globe*, St. John, N. B., was elected as a representative of that city to the Dominion Parliament in February last, although prior to his election his views favorable to annexation had been publicly proclaimed in the columns of his paper. In its issue of July 30th, the *Globe* says:

"Possibly the effect of commercial union would be to retard the progress of any annexation sentiment which is based on mere material considerations, inasmuch as those considerations would be satisfied by commercial union. The more ardent annexationists may therefore be expected to look with indifference upon it, if they do not really oppose that union, since it will not satisfy their aspirations."

We have thus made it clear:—

● (1) That a wide-spread desire for annexation does exist in the Dominion at the present time.

(2) That it has grown, not as a result of commercial union, but without it, and in all probability because of the lack of it.

(3) That commercial union could not at the same time be a help and a hindrance.

(4) That it is the opinion of prominent annexationists that it would prevent annexation. We therefore feel justified in appealing to every citizen who loves his country, and who desires a continuance of the old-time and justly revered British connexion, and who wishes to see a proud Dominion grow strong in the northern clime, to do his utmost to secure commercial union.

Four Objections Considered.

(1) Some of the fruit-growers of the Niagara Peninsula, and it may be elsewhere, oppose commercial union on the ground that it will affect their business adversely. They argue that American fruits ripen earlier to the southward; that those fruits would in such an event be rushed into our Canadian cities, in which case the cream in prices would be skimmed before our fruits would reach the market. If there is any force in this argument it would equally apply to the present condition of New York State. The fruit growers of this State have to compete with those of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and other States to the south of them. These Southern regions are a long way ahead of New York State in the maturing of their fruits, notwithstanding which, this State is pre-eminent for its fruit production. Its people not only hold their own against the States south of them, but the fruit industry is in a flourishing condition. Were it otherwise, our fruit growers would have nothing to fear, as we shall see.

The climate of the Niagara Peninsula is much the same as that of New York State, and the ripening period is not very different. If, therefore, the people of that State hold their own and flourish in the face of Southern competition, why may not the fruit growers of the Niagara Peninsula in the face of New York competition? It should not be forgotten that there may be a later as well as an earlier market. We know of a Quebec grower of strawberries who makes well out of the production of these late in the season. Why may not the same be achieved with other fruits? Why should our fruit growers seek special protection? If the advantages of location are worth anything, these people have them in a marked degree. Buffalo with its 250,000 citizens, twice as large as Toronto, is nearer the County of Lincoln than Toronto, and as near as Hamilton with but 40,000 inhabitants, and Rochester is much further by rail than the Ontario metropolis. In early fruits, contiguity to a market is of great value, they are so perishable in their nature. Hence, in the event of commercial union, our great centres would be as now far away from the base of American supplies, and our Canadian producers, in the very middle of consuming centres

and those near at hand, so that if our Canadian fruit growers in the Niagara Peninsula could not hold their own in the race, at least as well as the people of New York State, it would not be for lack of equal opportunities.

But there is another side to this question. The consumer has his rights as well as the producer. The consumers of fruit in Canada number about 5,000,000 of people, while the producers are but a fragmentary portion of the population. We cannot give the numbers but they are relatively small, as the entire population of Lincoln, the greatest fruit producing county in Ontario, is only 20,025, of which it is probable that not more than one in ten is a fruit grower. The major portion of the Dominion will not grow the more delicate kinds to advantage, yet the populations of these will be consumers if they can get them. The people of the Dominion imported during the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1886, from the United States, in the item of *green* fruits alone, to the value of \$501,669, and paid in duty for the privilege, \$101,441. In the item of green apples alone, the staple fruit of the Dominion, our people bought from the United States to the value of \$63,366, paying 40 cents duty on every one of the 31,278 barrels imported. It is not more fair that the consumers of fruit should pay this sum, for the special advantage of the fruit growers, than that the farmers should pay a heavy annual tax for the special advantage of those engaged in manufacturing, nor have the fruit growers of Canada any more right to tax the manufacturers a higher price for their products, than the latter have to tax the former a higher price for theirs. This brings us back to a fundamental principle of all true legislation, which never seeks the welfare of the few to the disadvantage of the many. We are aware that certain fruits are admitted free into the United States, and this fact proves amongst other things that if fruit growing here gives the Americans no concern as to fencing it out of their country, it will not pay us to fence it into ours with a tariff wall.

(2) Some oppose commercial union on the ground that it will involve difficulties in the adjustment of the tariff. No important change can be made in the trade policy of any country without some trouble, and we must not look for the completion of this union without some differences of opinion between the contracting parties to be reconciled. No treaty was ever made where such was not the case. In the completion of this union the contracting parties would require to fix upon a uniform tariff—this would be a matter of agreement between the countries. The tariffs could be pooled and re-distributed on the basis of population, or on some other basis, the excise tax in the two countries also being uniform, to prevent any undue advantage either way. In case of a deficiency of revenue in either country, direct taxation might be resorted to. It may be objected that this system would not succeed. Who can be sure of this until it is tried? The world is getting wiser. When men are being bled, it is better for them to be conscious than unconscious of the fact. When a responsibility of \$60.00 per head hangs over every man, woman and child in the

Dominion of a public debt, if taxed directly for its payment, they will be careful to know that more is not incurred.

In all this, where is there any surrender of *independence* on the part of Canada as some urge? It is a bargain between two contracting parties, and because one of these is twelve times stronger than the other numerically, and it may be twelve times as rich, is no more reason why they should not enter into an agreement mutually beneficial, than that one man should not deal with another at all because the latter was twelve times as wealthy.

(3) Some are very much exercised over this agitation because the United States has not as yet asked commercial union with Canada, nor do we expect that she will. It is by no means likely that a country of 55,000,000 of people, rich and prosperous, and largely self-contained, is going to ask such a thing of a country of but 5,000,000 of people. It should satisfy the demands of those who are the most expectant on this score, if she signify her willingness to enter into such a union, or to accede to the request for it when such request has been duly made. The treaty can never be consummated unless one government first approaches the other. No government will take this step unless in the avowed interests of the people, and the wishes of the people on a great commercial question cannot be ascertained without agitation and discussion; unless one of two contracting parties first approaches the other, no bargain can possibly be made of any kind. One country must take the initiative, and in the present instance Canada cannot reasonably expect this of the United States.

The objection is being well answered that the people of the United States are not stirring themselves in the matter. Resolutions in favor of the measure have been passed by the Detroit and Buffalo boards of trade, with overwhelming majorities, and the evidences are abundant that the frontier States are ready to give the movement a most hearty support. In the United States Congress Mr. Butterworth is already assured of a strong support, and from many parts of both countries the most cheering reports are coming in of widespread desire for a consummation of this union.

(4) Others object, as Canada now pays more per capita on imports, that in the re-distribution of the pooled receipts, if done on the per capita basis, the Canadians would not get a share in proportion to their output. There need be no difficulty here, as (a) it is not a settled fact that the per capita basis of distribution of pooled revenue receipts would be adopted, and (b) it is exceedingly probable that Canada would then import less per capita from abroad than the United States would under commercial union, for home consumption, as the latter country would supply Canada with a large portion of what she now gets from abroad, so that the advantage would remain with us.

Its Importance Demands Careful Consideration.

The subject of commercial union is one of the utmost gravity, and should be discussed in a manner worthy of the issues at stake, which none can say are not of the most momentous nature. It must be a matter of deep regret to the thoughtful and fair-minded portion of the community, that it has been handled by its opponents in many instances in a very different manner. Amongst the most powerful arguments that have been used against it in a considerable section of the Canadian press is that of calling Mr. Wiman "Ras," Mr. Butterworth, "Ben," and Mr. Fuller "Dairyman Fuller," a feat that could be equalled by the illiterate, boorish schoolboy, playing with his schoolmates on the street. What is the estimate that those journalists can put upon the intelligence of their readers when they give them that sort of thing for logic? Should they not rather feel that in the great work in which they are engaged, of teaching the people and moulding the thought of the nation, the use of methods ignoble as these are unworthy of their countenance, and do they not perceive that intelligence insulted in this way will have its revenge in the long run, and that the ridicule which they now pour out upon men whose shoe-latchet they have shown themselves unworthy to unloose, will recoil upon themselves, by a retributive law that reacts in all the lines of human intercourse? This course has been graphically depicted by a sketch that we have seen, representing a man going about with a pot of paint in one hand labelled "abuse," and a brush in the other, throwing it about right and left upon all who chanced to cross his path. What will history say to this style of dealing with the gravest question of economics that has ever been broached on the continent of America, a question that affects the welfare of 60,000,000 of people now, and it may be 100,000,000 before many years shall come and go? But we need not give ourselves concern on this score, for it is not this style of men and argument that figure on the page of history. Oblivion has a common cell wide enough to afford an asylum to all such heroes of the press for all time. Why should a movement that is sweeping over the country like the waters of a mighty torrent be arrested in its course by a dam of such materials? We have no anxiety lest it will, but some concern for the honor of our country in the eyes of foreigners, in the nature of the effusions that come forth from day to day from the avowed teachers of the people.

Who are the men who are being thus held up to ridicule? Erastus Wiman left Canada, his birth-place, some 25 years ago, an adventurer in a country that held out to him better prospects than his own. His way to his present eminence has been fought on the stepping-stones of a business career where every foot of ground has been contested in a competition open to every man in the Republic, and now the name of Erastus Wiman is a household word in every hamlet almost, from Hudson Bay to the Gulf of Mexico. He has built a business of proportions so gigantic that in the prosecution of it no less than

20,000 correspondents have become personally acquainted with its owner, and although 25 years a resident of the United States, he has during all that time retained his loyalty to the British crown, and has been deemed a worthy recipient of the special thanks of Her Majesty for the active part he took in the jubilee celebration last summer at New York. Whether Her Majesty's estimate of his services to Britain or that of those who brand him and all his associates in this movement with disloyalty is the correct one, we leave it for an impartial public to decide. The Hon. Benjamin Butterworth represents Cincinnati, one of the most populous cities in the Union, in the United States Congress. His career has been in keeping with his title, and his powers of oratory are such that his opponents in either country find it much more convenient to use the brush and paint pot, than to overthrow his arguments. Valancey E. Fuller has done more for the honor of Canada in the line of stock improvements than half the pressmen which she contains, and his fame in this line is only circumscribed by the limit of the world's knowledge of his country. Two of these men are Canadians, upon whose patriotic efforts for the improvement of their country, posterity will put a seal very different from that which it will place upon those who, from their obscure caverns, are shouting after them, much after the manner of the heroes of the school-ground.

The folly is supreme of pronouncing upon a question of this nature before it has been examined, and this is what has been done by a section of the Canadian press. We are justified in making this statement by the character of the assaults made upon it. This mistake has been made more than once in the progress of the most far-reaching questions relating to the welfare of nations. The progress of the grandest movement for the amelioration of the race that the world ever saw was fiercely assailed in its early days by those in power. In the heat of one of those bitter attacks a sensible man stood up and gave advice. He said, if this movement be of men, it will come to naught; but if from a Higher power, ye cannot overthrow it. And the wisdom of that advice has not only sounded through the intervening ages, but more than ever it was before is justified by the state of the world to-day. "Take heed what ye do unto those men," continued the sensible man, "lest haply ye be found opposing the designs of Him in whose hands are the destinies of men." This advice is as applicable to-day as it was eighteen centuries ago, and there is room for its application we are convinced in relation to this movement. It cannot be that a mighty continent, divided between two peoples, similar in origin, ancestry, sympathies, aims and religion, with a boundary line that rather brings them together than otherwise, and possessing resources that will be mutually helpful, are to be forever separated and debarred from trade by a tariff wall of man's devising.

The question has two sides—it would be strange if it hadn't—and it is the rightful mission of the opposition press to show the other side, but let them do it in the spirit worthy of their position and of the subject. Let them give

us argument rather than invective, and if, as patriotic citizens, they feel that there are strong reasons why Canada should not go into commercial union with the United States, all true sympathizers with the movement will be the first to thank them for the light thus cast upon a grandly important subject.

We have endeavored to make plain what is implied in commercial union. We have traced the origin and progress of the agitation ; we have shown that it is not a political question ; that its adoption will not discriminate against Great Britain to her hurt ; that the idea of an Imperial Zollverein between Britain and her colonies is utterly impracticable ; that the adoption of this union will save the confederation ; and that it will tend more than anything else to stimulate trade and to develop our resources. We have made it clear that it will greatly benefit the farmers, the fishermen and the lumbermen, and that it would give a great stimulus to the mining business ; that its effects upon manufactures will not be prejudicial ; that the annexation cry is foundationless, and that the charge of disloyalty is not true. We have considered the objections offered by the fruit growers, of those solicitous as to the manner of handling the revenues, and of those who are concerned over the relative strength of the agitation in Canada and the United States, and answered them, and have shown that the importance of these questions demands the most careful consideration on the part of every citizen of the State. We have made it clear that it would impel this country in the line of progress at a rate that we ourselves had not hitherto dared to hope for ; that it would in the end be fraught with material blessings to every citizen of the commonwealth ; that without it our industries must languish and our progress must be painfully slow, and that there are not necessarily any insuperable difficulties in the way of obtaining it, and now we ask you, reader, in the name of *reason*, is not all that we have said true ? If it is not true, as a loyal citizen of the State, it is your duty to try and expose the fallacy ; but if true, it is equally your duty to try and bring about this union at the earliest possible moment. True loyalty in matters relating to the welfare of the State makes no provision for *indifference*.

And now a word of caution to our brother farmers. Think out this matter for yourselves. Decide as to its merits without the counsel of those engaged in manufactures, who are forever feeling your pulse and telling you how you are, and what course will be best for you to adopt. Show to the world that you realize that you *have* interests not essentially connected with politics, and that you are prepared to *stand* by them at all hazards.

In the endeavor to secure this greatest possible material boon, let there be such unanimity of action amongst the farmers as was never witnessed before. Let them stand shoulder to shoulder and rank to rank, not a man of them in all the provinces but shall be ready to go down to battle. Though some are by the Atlantic and some beyond the Rockies, the cause is *one*, and the ties of a common calling and a common interest should bind all into a com-

pact unity, that in the deciding of this matter must prove invincible. While the Ontario farmers go down to battle those by the oceans must not tarry, and those in the North-west and Quebec, every man of them, should be at the post of duty. *If this cause is lost, it is the farmers who will lose it, and if it is won it is the compact unity of the farmers that will win it.* Where the farmers are not organized they should organize at once, and, under leaders of their own choosing, march onward rank upon rank, and cohort after cohort, determined to make no compromise, and sound no truce until victory is inscribed upon their banners, and commercial union between Canada and the United States is a consummated fact.



hile
and
post
won
are
own
ined
upon
states